2128

SOME
PROBLEMS OF KUṢĀṆA AND RĀJPŪT HISTORY

By

D. C. SIRCAR

UNIVERSITY OF CALCUTTA
1969

SOME
PROBLEMS OF KUṢĀṆA AND RĀJPUT HISTORY

By

D. C. SIRCAR

Carmichael Professor and Head of the Department of Ancient Indian History and Culture, Calcutta University.

The Alumni Association,
Department of Ancient Indian History and Culture,
University of Calcutta

1969

4128.

State Museum Library
Lucknow

Reprinted from the *Journal of Ancient Indian History,* Vol. II (1968-69), and the *Prācyavidyā-taraṅgiṇī* (1969) published by the Department of Ancient Indian History and Culture, Calcutta University.

Price Rs. 20.00

PREFACE

In the months of September and October, 1968, I attended the Dushanbe (Tajikistan, USSR) Conference on the Kuṣāṇas and raised certain points in the course of discussion on some of the papers presented there by various scholars. Soon after my return, I was invited to deliver a course of three lectures at ~~Problems of Rājpūt History' at the invitation of~~ the University, Dharwar, in the month of January, 1969, and selected 'Some Problems of Kuṣāṇa History' as the subject of my lectures. In the meantime, I delivered another course of three lectures on 'Some Problems of Rājpūt History' at the invitation of the University of Calcutta under its Bissessarlal Motilal Halwasiya Endowment. These two series of lectures are incorporated in the present volume. Some sections have been added now to the lectures on the Kuṣāṇas, delivered originally at Dharwar.

I shall consider my labour sufficiently rewarded if the lectures prove to be of some use to the students of Kuṣāṇa and Rājpūt history. It is a matter of regret that some misprints have crept in the pages in spite of my best efforts. For these, I crave the indulgence of the readers. Some of the errors have been corrected in the *Addenda et Corrigenda*.

The Index has been prepared by Dr. Sarjug Prasad Singh, a Junior Research Fellow at the Centre of Advanced Study in Ancient Indian History and Culture, Calcutta University, to whom my thanks are due. I am also thankful to Dr. D. R. Das and Dr. S. Bandyopadhyay, Senior Research Fellows at the Centre, who have helped me in seeing the pages through the press.

University of Calcutta,
August 15, 1969.

D. C. SIRCAR

CONTENTS

Subject *Page*

Part I

Problems of Kuṣāṇa History

I. The Dushanbe Conference on the Kuṣāṇas .. 1

II. Religious Leanings of the Kuṣāṇa Kings 9

III. Culture of the Kuṣāṇa Empire 19

IV. Foreigners and the Socio-Religious Life of Pañcanada 29

V. Northern Boundary of the Kuṣāṇa Empire 41

VI. Eastern Boundary of the Kuṣāṇa Empire .. 52

Part II

Problems of Rājpūt History

I. The Kalacuri-Haihaya and Sinda Elements in the Rājpūts 69

II. The Hūṇa and Nāgara Brāhmaṇa Elements .. 83

III. Fresh Light on the History of Rajasthan 95

Index 107

PART I

PROBLEMS OF KUṢĀṆA HISTORY

SOME PROBLEMS OF KUṢĀṆA HISTORY

I

THE DUSHANBE CONFERENCE ON THE KUṢĀṆAS

At the 14th session of the General Conference of the UNESCO held about the close of 1966, a resolution was adopted authorising the Director General to initiate, in 1967-68, a project concerning the study of the civilizations of the peoples of Central Asia, within the period 1967-70. The Conference also decided that the area covered by the project includes the Central Asian Republics of the USSR (i.e. Kirgizia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan) as well as Afghanistan, Pakistan, India and Iran. It was felt that the civilizations of the Central Asian peoples had not been studied at 'the international level' and that progress in that direction depended on a closer co-operation of specialists from the region itself and from various parts of the world. The project was believed to be justified from the view point of promoting better cultural relations among nations.

A meeting of experts convened by the UNESCO in April 1967 recommended that the study of the archaeology and history of Central Asia in the Kuṣāṇa period should be taken up in the first instance. It was supposed that the Kuṣāṇa empire represented a period of peaceful synthesis of various cultures and peoples of different origins, blending them into one civilization at least from the economic and social points of view. It was therefore decided at the meeting that a conference would be convened to deal with the archaeology and history of the Kuṣāṇa age in order to assess the available data and to ensure progress of the studies. This conference was organised at Dushanbe, capital of the Republic of Tajikistan, within the framework of the UNESCO Central Asian project, by the Committee for the Study of the Civilizations of Central Asia pertaining to the USSR Commission for the UNESCO and by the Organising Committee established by the Academy of Sciences of the Tajik Soviet Socialist Republic, with the co-operation of the research institutes of the Academies of Sciences of the USSR and the Soviet Republics of Central Asia as well as the Ministries of Culture of the USSR and the said Republics and with contributions from the art and archaeological museums of the USSR. The Conference started on the 27th September, 1968, and ended on the 5th October, 1968. The papers were read in the morning and evening sessions every day in the same hall one after another and there was provision for some discussion on them at the end of each such session.

The Dushanbe Conference was attended by a large number of scholars from all over the world. Its organisation was excellent, and the participants from many countries, including those from India, were treated with great kindness and consideration. An important feature of the conference, as expected, was that it gave an opportunity to Indologists of different countries to meet one another and exchange views. The participants to the Conference had also an opportunity of visiting some of the excavated sites of Tajikistan and Uzbekistan. The great skill with which the Soviet archaeologists have laid bare the ancient painting on a mud wall at Afrasiyab was highly appreciated by the visitors.

As was expected, some of the participants to the conference had contributions to Kuṣāṇa history to their credit. Thus the author of these lines seems to have been invited to attend the Conference because he is the author of the chapters on the rule of foreigners in ancient India including the Kuṣāṇas, in Bhāratīya Vidyā Bhavan's *History and Culture of the Indian People*, Vol. II (*The Age of Imperial Unity*), Bombay, 1951, as well as of a discourse on early Indian reckonings including the Kaṇiṣka era in the *Vikrama Volume*, Ujjain, 1948, and also in his *Indian Epigraphy*, Delhi, 1965 ; cf. also *Ancient Malwa and the Vikramāditya Tradition*, Delhi, 1969.

Unfortunately, because the idea of convening the Conference was not purely academic, a large number of the participants were really not experts in Kuṣāṇa history, so that many of the papers presented at the Conference were uninspiring. Some of them merely recapitulated facts already known from standard works, while some others described the results of archaeological excavations in Central Asian territories, which, however, could not be easily associated with the great Kuṣāṇas, the unearthed objects being often later in date. It is strange that one participant presented a paper on the so-called communication of Mātṛceṭa addressed to Kanika (Kaṇiṣka) as if it was a new discovery. The subject is, however, quite well known and has been dealt with by many scholars. See, e.g., M. Winternitz, *A History of Indian Literature*, Vol. II, Calcutta, pp. 269 ff. and notes ; F.W. Thomas in the *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. XXXII, 1903, pp. 345ff, ; etc. It appeared that such books and journals were not easily available to the author of the paper in question at the institution or in the country which he represented. It is equally strange that another participant was vigorously upholding the long exploded theory of R.G. Bhandarkar that Kaṇiṣka I ascended the throne so late as in 278 A. D. Some of the decisive arguments against this view offered by scholars including G. Jouveau-Dubreuil in his *Ancient History of the Deccan* (Pondicherry, 1920) and H.C. Raychaudhuri in his *Political History of Ancient India* (Calcutta University, 1st ed., 1923, and 6th ed., 1953), were pointed out in the course of the discussion at the end of the session in question. It is a matter of regret, however, that the author of the paper did not realise the absurdity of the theory, and it was announced in the newspapers that the ascription of Kaṇiṣka's accession to 278 A.D. had been accepted by the majority of the participants at the Dushanbe Conference, apparently because only a few persons participated in such discussions.

The arguments that may be offered against 278 A.D. as the date of Kaṇiṣka's accession are the following—(1) Palaeography seems to go against assigning Kaṇiṣka I to a date more than a century after Rudradāman I (middle of the 2nd century A.D.).[1] (2) Vāsudeva's rule over the Mathurā region in the year 98 of the Kaṇiṣka era, if it corresponds to 376 A.D., cannot be reconciled with the extirpation of the Nāgas of Mathurā and other areas by Samudragupta (c. 335-76 A.D.) about the middle of the fourth century A.D. and the find of the Mathurā inscription of Candragupta II, dated 380-81 A.D.[2] (3) The Purāṇas suggest the rule of seven Nāga kings at Mathurā apparently between the rule of the Kuṣāṇas and the Gupta conquest.[3] (4) According to tradition, Kaṇiṣka was a contemporary of king Vijayakīrti of Khotan who flourished in the second century A.D.[4] (5) Tradition again represents Huviṣka

---

[1] Cf. Ojha, *Prācīn Bhāratīya Lipimālā*, Plates VI and VIII.

[2] Cf. reference to the extirpation of Gaṇapatināga, Nāgasena, Nāgadatta, etc., by Samudragupta in the Allahabad pillar inscription (*Sel. Ins.*, 1965 ed., pp. 262 ff.). For the Mathurā inscription of 380-81 A.D., see *ibid.*, pp. 277 ff.

[3] Cf. *Nava-Nāgās=tu bhokṣyanti purīṁ Campāvatīṁ nṛpāḥ* |
Mathurāṁ tu purīṁ ramyāṁ Nāgā bhokṣyanti sapta vai ||
(Pargiter, *The Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age*, p. 53).

[4] Sten Konow, *CII*, Vol. II, Part I, p. lxxii; *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XIV, p. 142.

(Kaṇiṣka years 28-60) and probably Kaṇiṣka II (year 41) as contemporaries of the Buddhist teacher Nāgārjuna flourishing in the age of a powerful Śātavāhana king who could not have flourished later than the second century A.D.[5] (6) According to the Catalogue of the Chinese Tripiṭaka, An-shi-kao (148-70 A.D.) translated the *Mārgabhūmisūtra* by Saṅgharakṣa who had been a chaplain of Kaṇiṣka so that Kaṇiṣka I must have ascended the throne considerably before 170 A.D.[6] (7) If Kaṇiṣka I ascended the throne in 278 A.D., it is difficult to place Po-t'iao (Vāsudeva) in 130 A.D. as is indicated by the Chinese sources.[7] (8) Kaṇiṣka I was the founder of an era ; but there is no trace of an era starting from 278 A.D.[8] (9) The fact that a person, who died in 170 A.D., translated a book written by one of Kaṇiṣka's officers, suggests that Kaṇiṣka could have hardly flourished later than the Śaka Satrap Rudradrāman I whose latest known date is 150 A.D. and who probably died a few years later, while the Buddhist tradition about Rudradāman's expedition against Śākala (i.e. Sialkot in West Pakistan)[9] would suggest that the Satrap flourished later than Kaṇiṣka and some of his immediate successors whose direct control must have been exercised over territories including the Sialkot District.[10] Incidentally, it may be pointed out that this fact would support the identification of the Kaṇiṣka and Śaka eras and Kaṇiṣka's accession in 78 A.D.

---

[5] Raychaudhuri, *PHAI*, 1938 ed., p. 391 and note 3, p. 397 and note 5; *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, I. 173; *Harṣacarita* (Ch. VIII), trans. Cowell and Thomas, p. 252; Watters, *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India*, Vol. II, p. 200. The successors of Yajña-Ṣātakarṇi, who ended his rule about 200 A.D., were not powerful kings.

[6] Raychaudhuri, *op. cit.*, p. 391 and note 3; Eliot, *Hinduism and Buddhism*, Vol. II, p. 64, note; Nanjio's Catalogue, App. II, 4.

[7] Sten Konow, *op. cit.*, p. lxxvi.

[8] We have epigraphic records of Kaṇiṣka I dated in years 3-23, of Vāsiṣka in years 24-28, of Huviṣka in years 28-60, of Kaṇiṣka II in year 41 and of Vāsudeva I in years 64(or 67)-98. The theory of omitted hundreds can hardly be accepted without very strong evidence in its support.

[9] For the Buddhist tradition, see *Journ. Anc. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. I, p. 116.

As noted already only a few people took part in the discussions, the standard of which was unfortunately not as high as it was expected to be. One of the papers suggested that Puruṣapura or Peshāwar was not the capital of the Kuṣāṇa king Kaṇiṣka. Of course it was pointed out in the course of discussion that Hiuen-tsang represents Kaṇiṣka as the king of Gandhāra and mentions Puruṣapura as the capital of the country, so that, even if Kaṇiṣka had several capitals, Puruṣapura must have been one of them. Strangely enough, even those participants who are known to have written on Kuṣāṇa history, were generally unable or disinclined to take part in this kind of controversy and say anything this way or that.

In this connection we may refer to the following passages from Watters' translation of Hiuen-tsang's *Si-yu-ki*—"When Kaṇiṣka reigned in Gandhāra, his power reached the neighbouring States and his influences extended to distant regions. As he kept order by military rule over a wide territory reaching to the east of the T'sung-ling (i.e. the Pamirs)......" ;[11] "the Kan-to-lo (Gandhāra) country.........The capital Pu-lu-so-pu-lo (Puruṣapura) was above 40 *li* in circuit."[12] Likewise, Beal's translation has—"According to tradition, Kaṇiṣka-Rāja of Gandhāra in old days, having subdued all the neighbouring provinces and brought into obedience people of distant countries, governed by his army a wide territory, even to the east of the T'sung-ling mountains."[13]

---

[10] The discovery of the inscriptions of Kaṇiṣka I at Mathurā in Western U.P. in India and Suivihar near Bahawalpur in West Pakistan shows that Sialkot lying far to the north of the area between those two places was under the full control of the Kuṣāṇa emperor. It is difficult to believe that the Satrap Rudradāman I fought with the emperor Kaṇiṣka I and still succeeded in retaining his position. The Satrap seems to have been a semi-independent feudatory of a Kuṣāṇa king who was weaker than Kaṇiṣka I and must have been one of the latter's successors. Cf. also Kusāṇa inscriptions at Sanchi.

[11] Watters, *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India,* Vol. I, p. 124.

When we were listening to some of the papers presented by a number of archaeologists, it appeared to us that the suppositions of at least some of them were more or less as follows—(1) that all the Kuṣāṇa kings were staunch followers of the Buddhist faith and that all of them were builders of innumerable Buddhist monasteries throughout their dominions ; (2) that the empire of the Kuṣāṇas was characterised by a distinct culture for which the monarchs alone were responsible ; and (3) that the southern portions of the Central Asian Republics of the USSR lying to the north of the Oxus river were integral parts of the dominions of all the Kuṣāṇa emperors. In our opinion, none of these views can be regarded as proved historical facts, so that they are likely to remain merely unproved guesses until further evidence is forthcoming on the points. It appears to us—(1) that only some of the Kuṣāṇa emperors had Buddhist leanings and that most of the monasteries built during their reigns were due to private enterprise ; (2) that there was nothing like a uniform culture in the Kuṣāṇa empire, different regions in it (e. g. Gandhāra and Mathurā) enjoying quite different cultures and that the so-called Kuṣāṇa culture appears to be largely borrowed from the Scythians, Parthians, Greeks, Iranians, Indians and Chinese ; and (3) that there is no evidence of Kuṣāṇa rule in the trans-Oxus region during the reigns of Kaṇiṣka I and his immediate successors including Vāsudeva I.

---

[12] *Ibid.*, pp. 198-99.

[13] Beal, *Buddhist Records of the Western World*, Calcutta reprint. Vol. I, pp. 118-19.

The problems referred to above require a thorough and careful examination. Closely allied to them is the question of the eastern boundary of the Kuṣāṇa empire which was the subject of the paper presented by us at the Dushanbe Conference. In this connection, reference should also be made to another interesting question raised at the Conference by a participant who appeared to suppose that, during the Kuṣāṇa age, Takṣaśilā was still a popular seat of learning, to which students of various parts of India are known to have flocked in an earlier age. It appears to us that the popularity of Takṣaśilā must have suffered in the period in question, because, as a result of the foreign occupation, the whole area watered by the Indus and its five eastern tributaries was regarded by the people of the other parts of our subcontinent as an unholy land inhabited by godless people and unfit for being visited by righteous men.

II

RELIGIOUS LEANINGS OF THE KUṢĀṆA KINGS

Kujula Kadphises (Kadphises I), the first king of the Kuṣāṇa house, issued certain copper coins, the obverse of which exhibits the diademed bust of the Greek king Hermaios with the Greek legends—*Basileos Sterossy Ermaiou*, "[Coin of] King Hermaios, the Saviour", on the earlier issues, and *Kozoulou Kadphizou Korsolou*, "[Coin of] Kujula Kadphises, the Kuṣāṇa", on the issues which appear to be later than the former. The reverse of both these groups of coins has the Prakrit legend written in Kharoṣṭhī characters—*Kujula-Kasasa Kuṣana-yavugasa dhrama-ṭhidasa*," "[Coin of] the Kuṣāṇa Prince Kujula Kadphises, who is Steadfast in the Faith."[1]

Another type of the same king's copper coins has on the obverse, the king's diademed head (supposed to be imitated from the coins of Augustus) and the Greek legend *Khoransu Zaoou Kozola-Kadaphes*, "Coin of Kujula Kadphises, the Kuṣāṇa Prince", the Prakrit-Kharoṣṭhī legend on the reverse being—*Kuyula-Kaphasa Sacadhrama-ṭhitasa Khuṣanasa Yaüasa*, ["Coin of] the Kuṣāṇa Prince Kujula Kadphises who is Steadfast in the True Faith."[2]

The epithets *Dhrama-ṭhida* (*Dharma-sthita*) and *Saca-dhrama-ṭhita* (*Satya-dharma-sthita*) have been generally regarded by numismatists to indicate the Kuṣāṇa king's adherence to the Buddhist faith. Another type of copper coins on which the legends cannot be read, but the obverse symbol of which is the Buddha, seated in conventional attitude with uncertain object in right hand, has been attributed to the same king.[3] It is thus possible to think that Kadphises I was a Buddhist. It may be noted, however, that an early inscription is known to apply the epithet *satya-dharma-sthita* to a devotee of the god Sarva or Śiva.[4] There is therefore a possibility that Kadphises I was a Śaiva like his son Kadphises II.

---

[1] Whitehead, *Catalogue of Coins in the Punjab Museum, Lahore*, Vol. I, pp. 178-79.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 181.

Kujula's son and successor Vima Kadphises (Kadphises II) issued gold coins, the reverse side of which generally represented the god Siva or the god's emblem, the trident-battleaxe. Śiva is often standing, wearing necklace, with long trident in right hand and leaning against the bull. Sometimes, the god has long trident-battleaxe in his right hand and the gourd and tiger skin in left hand. The reverse legend in Prakrit and Kharoṣṭhī is—*Maharajasa rajadirajasa sarvaloga-iśvarasa Mahiśvarasa Vima-Kaṭphisasa tradarasa*, "[Coin of] Vima Kadphises, the King, the

---

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 181-82. Some scholars think that the figure of the Buddha occurs on the coins (cf. Smith's Catalogue, Plate VIII. 4) of the Śaka king Maues (c. 20 B.C.-25 A.D.) and on certain early Ujjayinī issues. Others are doubtful about this. See J. N. Banerjea, *Development of Hindu Iconography*, 2nd ed., p. 112.

[4] A Mathura inscription refers to a person as *satyadha*[*r**]*ma-sthitasya Nanaya*(*yā*)*t* = *Sarva-śca*(*Ca*)*ṇḍavīr-ātisṛṣṭa-rājyasya* (cf. Lüders, *Mathura Inscriptions*, p. 138). The passage reminds us of *Maheśvara-Mahāsen-ātisṛṣṭa-rājya-vibhava* and of *Maheśvara-Mahāsen-ātisṛṣṭa-rājya* of other inscriptions (*Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXVIII, p. 13, note 3). The three passages may suggest either that the gods Sarva (Śiva) and Caṇḍavīra in the first case and Maheśvara (Śiva) and Mahāsena (Skanda-Kārttikeya) in the second and third bestowed kingdoms to their devotees or that, of the three persons, the first dedicated his kingdom to the gods Sarva and Caṇḍavīra and the second and third their dominions to the gods Maheśvara and Mahāsena. Cf. *The Age of Imperial Unity*, ed. Majumdar, p. 161, notes 1 and 4; Sircar, *Studies in Indian Coins*, pp. 212 ff.; *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXX, p. 19. If the above interpretations of the passages are accepted, the epithet *Satya-dharma-sthita* in the first passage as well as on the coins of Kadphises I loses its Buddhistic significance.

Supreme King of Kings, the Saviour who is a Māheśvara (devotee of Maheśvara or Śiva) and the lord of the whole world."[5] There is little doubt that Kadphises II was a devotee of the god Śiva.

On the reverse of the coins of Kaṇiṣka I, we have the representations of—(1) the fire-god Athsho (Persian *Atash*), (2) the Moon-god Mao, (3) the Sun-god Miiro, Mioro (or Mithra) or Miuro (i.e. Neo-Sanskrit *Mihira*), (4) the mother-goddess Nana, Nanaia or Nanashao, (5) the war-god Orlagno (Persian *Bahram*), (6) the fire-god Pharro (Persian *Farr*), (7) the Sun-god Helios, (8) the wind-god Oado (Vado = Sanskrit *Vāta*), (9) Boddo (Buddha), (10) Mozdooano (Ahura Mazda), (11) the Greek fire-god Hephaistos, (12) Salene, (13) Manaobago, (14) Lrooaspo, etc.[6] This seems to suggest that the king had a catholic religious policy and represented himself to his subjects, belonging to different religious communities all over his vast empire, as full of respect towards the deities worshipped by them. It will be seen that the Buddha was only one of the many divinities represented on the coins and named in the legends, so that their issuer could hardly have been a staunch Buddhist, though he appears to have had Buddhistic leanings. By this time, the development of the Mahāyāna form of Buddhism had already started and the sage Gautama the Buddha had already become, in practice, a god ready to hear the prayers of the faithful.[7]

An inscription[8] from Surkh Kotal near Baglan on the Kunduz river in Northern Afghanistan speaks of the repairs to a temple called *Kaneshko Oanindo Bago laggo* (the sanctuary of the Victorious Kaṇiṣka), in the year 31 of the Kaṇiṣka era. This was a Fire temple of the Iranian type and not a Buddhist religious establishment.[9] Kaṇiṣka I, whose name is apparently associated with the temple, thus does not appear to have been a staunch Buddhist.

---

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 183 ff.

[6] *Ibid.*, pp. 186 ff.; *Sel. Ins.*, 1965 ed., p. 147, note 6.

[7] Smith, *E. Hist. Ind.*, 1924 ed., p. 282.

[8] *BSOAS*, Vol. XXIII, pp. 47 ff.; cf. *Journ. As.*, 1958, pp. 345 ff.

According to Buddhist tradition, king Kaṇiṣka was a devout Buddhist and a great patron of Buddhism, who convened the Fourth Buddhist Council probably in Kashmir.[10] "The stories told about Kaṇiṣka's conversion and his subsequent zeal for Buddhism have so much resemblance to the Aśoka legends that it is difficult to decide how far they are traditions of actual fact and how far merely echoes of an older tradition."[11] It is also not easy to determine whether the Buddhist Kaṇiṣka was the first king of that name or one of his successors bearing the same name.

According to Hiuen-tsang, the Buddhist king Kaṇiṣka of Gandhāra built at the capital of the country, called Puruṣapura (Peshāwar), a magnificent *stūpa* 400 feet high with a superstructure of gilt-copper discs, its base being in five stages and 150 feet in height.[12] Kaṇiṣka also built a *vihāra* near the *stūpa*.[13] In the 11th century, Al-Bīrūnī speaks of the Kanik-caitya (Kaṇiṣka-caitya) at Purushāvar (Peshāwar).[14] According to the Ghoshravan inscription,[15] Vīradeva, son of the Brāhmaṇa Indragupta of Nagarahāra (Jalalabad), had studied at the feet of *Ācārya* Sarvajñaśānti as the Kaṇiṣka-mahāvihāra, no doubt at Puruṣapura, before he came to the Yaśovamapura-vihāra (at Ghoshravan near Biharsharif in the Patna District, Bihar) and was honoured by king Devapāla (c. 810-50 A.D.). In any case, the founder of the Kaṇiṣka *stūpa* and monastery at Peshāwar may have been a devout Buddhist though it is uncertain whether he has to be identified with Kaṇiṣka I or one of his namesakes among his successors.

---

[9] See *Journal Asiatique*, 1958, pp. 368 ff.

[10] Smith, *op. cit.*, pp. 283 ff.

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 280.

[12] Watters, *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India*, Vol. I, pp. 203 ff.

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 208.

[14] Sachau, *Alberuni's India*, Vol. II, p. 11.

[15] *Gauḍalekhamālā*, pp. 46 ff.

The *Rājataraṅgiṇī* speaks of the three Turuṣka kings of Kashmir named Huṣka, Juṣka and Kaṇiṣka (usually identified with Huviṣka, Vāsiṣka or Vajeska, and Kaṇiṣka II of the Ara inscription of the Kaṇiṣka year 41)[16] and represents them as having Buddhist leanings.[17] "Then there was, in this land, three kings called Huṣka, Juṣka and Kaṇiṣka, who built three towns named after them (Huṣkapura, Juṣkapura and Kaṇiṣkapura). That wise king Juṣka, who built Juṣkapura with its *vihāra* was also the founder of Jayasvāmipura (apparently named after the god Jayasvāmin, a form of Viṣṇu).[18] These kings who were given to acts of piety, though descended from the Turuṣka race, built at Śuṣkaletra[19] and other places *maṭhas*, *caityas* and similar structures. During the power ul reign of these kings, the land of Kashmir was, to a great extent, in the possession of the Bauddhas who, by practising the law of religious mendicancy (*pravrajyā*), had acquired great renown. At that time, one hundred and fifty years had passed in this terrestrial world since the blessed Śākyasiṁha (the Buddha) had acquired *parinirvāṇa*. And a Bodhisattva lived then in this country as the sole lord of the land, namely, the glorious Nāgārjuna who resided at Ṣaḍarhadvana."[20] The tradition recorded in the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* may suggest that the said Kuṣāṇa kings were remembered by the people of early medieval Kashmir primarily as patrons of Buddhism.

---

[16] Kalhaṇa, the author of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, is believed to represent Huṣka, Juṣka and Kaṇiṣka as having ruled simultaneously (Stein, *Kalhaṇa's Rājataraṅgiṇī*, Vol. I, Intro., p. 76). The rule of Kaṇiṣka II (year 41) falls within Huviṣka's reign period (years 28-60) while the Sanchi inscription of Vāsiṣka (years 24-28), dated year 28 *Hemanta* 1 *Divasa* 5 (i.e. Mārgaśīrṣa-badi 5) is later than the Mathura inscription of Huviṣka, dated 28, first day of the month of Gurpiya (Bhādrapada-Āśvina) since the year seems to have started after the Phālguna fullmoon (i.e. with *Pūrṇimānta* Caitra). See *Sel. Ins.*, Vol. I, 1965 ed., pp. 150 ff. (cf. p. 152, note 8).

[17] I. 168 ff.

[18] III. 350; V. 449; cf. III. 453-54. Stein, in his translation, regards Jayasvāmin correctly as Viṣṇu at one place (p. 102), but as the Sun-god elsewhere (p. 232), because, in the latter case, the god is called Jayasvāmi-virocana. The name Virocana, however, is also applied to Viṣṇu according to Monier-Williams' Sanskrit-English Dictionary.

Nothing is clearly known about the religious inclinations of Vāsiṣka from his inscriptions. We have as yet discovered no coins of this king. If, however, his identification with Juṣka of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* is accepted, the king had probably both Vaiṣṇavite and Buddhistic leanings. This is in keeping with the representation of diverse divinities on the reverse of the coins of Kaṇiṣka I and the erection, by the same king, of a *vihāra* or *caitya* at Peshāwar and an Iranian Fire temple at Surkh Kotal. Kalhaṇa's reference to the predominance of the Buddhists in the time of the Turuṣka (Kuṣāṇa) kings may be true, because the Śaka-Kuṣāṇa age witnessed the rise and development of the Mahāyāna form of Buddhism, and it

---

[19] Suṣkaletra (modern Haklitre in the Doonsoo Pargana) and Vitastātra (modern Vithvutur near Vernag, the source of the Vitastā) were famous for the numerous Buddhist monasteries built by Aśoka (*Rājataraṅgiṇī*, I. 102). The Dharmāraṇyavihāra at the latter place (*ibid.*, I. 103) is supposed to have been pre-Aśokan.

[20] Stein, *op. cit.*, pp. 30-31. The tradition that the Kuṣāṇa kings flourished 150 years after the Buddha's death, i.e. in the latter half of the fourth century B.C., is of course wrong by several centuries.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preseyation Foundation, Chandigarh

is well known that the growth of a new doctrine or sect is often characterised by great popular enthusiasm. The Buddhist tradition that the Fourth Buddhist Council was held in the Kashmir region under the patronage of king Kaṇiṣka cannot be dissociated from the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* tradition regarding the influence of the Buddhists in the area.

Like the coins of Kaṇiṣka I, the reverse of Huviṣka's coins also exhibits a variety of divinities—(1) Athsho (Greek *Hepahistos* and Indian *Viśvakarman*), (2) the goddess of abundance Ardoksho, (3) the Moon-god Manaobago or Mao, (4) the Sun-god Helios, Anio, Miiro or Mioro, (5) the goddess Nanashao, (6) the goddess Oaninda, (7) the god Oesha (Vṛṣa, i.e. Śiva), (8) the war-god Shaoreoro (Persian *Shahrewar*, Greek *Ares*), (9) Herakles, (10) the fire-god Pharro (Persian *Farr*), (11) the four-armed god Ooshna (Viṣṇu), (12) Gaṇeśa (Śiva), (13) Ommo (Umā)), (14) Skando-Komaro (Skada-Kumāra), (15) Bizago (Viśākha), (16) Maasena (Mahāsena), (17) Nana and Oesho together, (18) Rom, (19) Oron, (20) Sarapho, (21) Lrooaspo, (22) Oakhsho, (23) Araikhsho, etc.[21] This shows that, like Kaṇiṣka, Huviṣka also had leanings towards most of the religious faiths prevalent among the peoples of his vast empire.

A Mathurā inscription,[22] however, speaks of the *vihāra* of *Mahārāja Rājātirāja Devaputra* Huviṣka. Another Mathurā inscription[23] of Huviṣka's reign (year 51) mentions the *Mahārāja-Devaputra-vihāra* which may be the same monastery. A person installed the relics of the Buddha in a

---

[21] *Sel. Ins.*, 1965 ed., p. 160, note 6; Whitehead, *op. cit.*, pp. 194 ff. J. N. Banerjea traced the Harihara form combining Śiva and Viṣṇu on a coin of Huviṣka (*Development of Hindu Iconography*, 2nd ed., pp. 123-24).

[22] *Sel. Ins.*, *op. cit.*, pp. 157-58.

[23] Lüders, *Mathura Inscriptions*, p. 68, No. 62.

vihāra about 30 miles to the west of Kabul with the idea that the principal share of his religious merit would go to *Mahārāja Rājātirāja* Huviṣka.[24] This is of course of no special significance, because another Mathurā inscription,[25] recording the creation of a permanent endowment for running a *puṇya-śālā* for catering free food to one hundred Brāhmaṇas per month, says that the religious merit accruing to the pious act would go to *Devaputra Ṣāhi* Huviṣka and to those who loved him. This suggests that Huviṣka's relations with the Brāhmaṇists were quite cordial.

Cunningham noticed a nicolo seal of a Kuṣāṇa ruler whom he identified with Huviṣka on account of the similarity of the headdress and garment.[26] He says about the device, "a Kuṣāṇa chief standing in a respectful pose with folded hands before the four-armed god Viṣṇu ; the god carries in his four hands a wheel (shown exactly like a cart-wheel) a mace, a ring-like object and a globular thing ; there is an inscription in illegible characters by the side of the god." The inscription, written in the Tocharian language and a cursive modification of the Greek script, has been deciphered by Ghirshman as containing the names of the gods Mihira (the Iranian Sun-god), Viṣṇu and Śiva.[27]

The Kuṣāṇa king Vāsudeva bears the Vaiṣṇavite name of Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa ; but the reverse of some of his coins bears the representation of the goddesses Nana and Ardoksho though the Indian god Śiva (Oesho) is found on a large number of them.[28] There is no evidence of Vāsudeva's Buddhist leanings.

---

[24] *Ibid.*, pp. 58-59.

[25] *Ibid.*, pp. 151 ff. Another Mathura inscription (Lüders, *op. cit.*, pp. 138 ff.) refers to some pious activity for increasing the longevity and strength of *Mahārāja Rājātirāja Devaputra* Huviṣka, although the nature of the work cannot be determined owing to the damaged condition of the epigraph.

[26] See *Num. Chron.*, 1893, pp. 126-27, Pl. X, fig. 2; cf. J. N. Banerjea, *op. cit.*, p. 124.

[27] *Les Chionites Hepthalites*, pp. 55-58, fig. 55; Pl. VII. 1. Ghirshman takes the devotee to be a Hūṇa chief, though the seal appears to be earlier than the advent of the Hūṇas in India.

The evidence at our disposal would thus show that Kadphises I may have been a Buddhist or a Śaiva and Kaṇiṣka I (or II) and Huviṣka may have had leanings towards Buddhism as well as to some other religious faiths ; but Kadphises II was a devotee of Siva, and nothing is known about the Buddhist leanings of Vāsudeva, while Vāsiṣka may have had both Vaiṣṇava and Buddhist leanings. Under these circumstances, it is difficult to think that the Kuṣāṇa kings were all staunch followers of Buddhism. It is equally difficult to attribute most pre-Muslim Buddhist establishments discovered in or in the neighbourhood of the territory ruled by the Kusāṇas from the foundation of the house by Kadphises I in the first half of the first century A.D. down to the time of Ardashīr Babagan (226-41 A.D.), the founder of the Sassanian dynasty of Iran, who subjugated the Kuṣāṇa king, to Kuṣāṇa inspiration. It appears that the Kuṣāṇas followed a Catholic religious policy and patronised different faiths even though they may have had special leanings towards particular creeds like Buddhism. There can be little doubt that the Buddhist subjects of the Kuṣāṇa emperors were responsible for most of the Buddhist religious establishments raised during their age in different parts of of their empire.

It may be argued that Kaṇiṣka's catholic religious policy turned into a staunch devotion to Buddhism later in his old age, and attention may be drawn to the case of king Harṣavardhana Śīlāditya(606-47 A.D.) of Kanauj, who is represented as a *Paramamāhśevara* (devout worshipper of Maheśvara or Śiva) in his inscriptions[29] dated 627 and 630 A.D., though the Chinese pilgrim Hiuen-tsang, who travelled in India from 629 to 643 A.D., speaks of the said king's staunch devotion to the Buddha.[30] Although this may not be improbable, we cannot possibly ignore the case of the great Mughul emperor Akbar(1556-1605 A.D.) whose "conduct at different times justified Christians, Hindus, Jains and Parsees in severally claiming him as one of themselves."[31]

---

[28] Whitehead, *op. cit.*, pp. 208 ff.

---

[29] *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. I, pp. 72 ff.; Vol. IV, pp. 210 ff.

[30] See Watters, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 344, 364, etc.

[31] Smith, *Oxford History of India*, Part II, 1920, p. 360.

III

CULTURE OF THE KUṢĀṆA EMPIRE

We know that, according to the Chinese annals, the Kuṣāṇas (i.e. the people of the Kuei-shuang or Kouei-chouang principality in the land to the south of the Oxus) were a branch of the great Yue-chi race. According to Ssuma-ch'ien who recorded the story of the travels of the celebrated Chinese envoy Chang-K'ien in the *Sse-ki* or *Shi-ki* completed before 91 B.C., the nomadic Yue-chi people were dwelling, about 165 B.C., in the land between the Tsunn-hoang (Tun-huang) country and the K'i-lien mountains or Tien-chan range in Chinese Turkestan (in the Kan-suh Province in North-Western China according to some). They were defeated and expelled from their country by the Hiung-nu and, in the course of their westward migration, defeated the Wu-sun occupying the basin of the Ili river and its southern tributaries to the north of the Taklamakan (Gobi) desert. The Yue-chi moved further west and occupied the Śaka land in the valley of the Jaxartes, driving out the Śakas to the south of the river and compelling their king to take refuge in Ki-pin (Kafiristan together with the adjoining eastern region). After sometime, the Wu-sun, with Hiung-nu help, drove out the Yue-chi from the Jaxartes valley to the valley of the Oxus where the latter reduced the Ta-hia country to subjection. The Yue-chi capital was to the north of the Oxus in the Bukhara region (ancient Sogdiana) when Chang-K'ien visited the area shortly before 125 B.C.

According to Pan-ku's *Ts'ien Han-shu* ('Annals of the First Han Dynasty' dealing with the period from 206 B.C. to 24 A.D. and completed by the author's sister after his death), (1) the Yue-chi were no longer a nomadic people, (2) the great Yue-chi people, who had their capital at Kien-chi or Kien-she to the north of the Oxus, occupied Tahia to the south of the river and Ki-pin lay at its southern frontier, and (3) the new territory had become divided into five principalities—(1) Kiu-mi (possibly, Wakhan in North-Eastern Afghaniststan), (2) Chouang-mi or Shuang-mi (possibly, Chitral), (3) Kouei-chouang or Kuei-shuang (Kuṣāṇa, possibly between Chitral and the Panjshir valley), (4) Hi-thun (Parwan on the Panjshir river), and (5) Kao-fu (Kabul, a mistake for Tou-mi according to a later author). This division of the Yue-chi territory may be roughly assigned to c. 100 B.C.

According to Fan-ye's *Hou Han-shu* ('Annals of the Later Han Dynasty' covering the period 25-220 A.D. and based on Pan-Young's report of c. 125 A.D. and other records), the capital of the Yue-chi was at Lan-shi or Lan-sheu (in Tahia) in the present Badakhshan (North-Eastern Afghanistan) to the south of the Oxus. He says, "In old days the Yue-chi were vanquished by the Hiung-nu. They thus went to Ta-hia and divided the kingdom among five Hi-hou or Yab-gou......More than hundred years after that, the Yabgou of Kouei-chouang (Kuṣāṇa) named Kieou-tsieou-kio (Kusuluka = Kujula, i.e. Kadphises I) attacked and vanquished the other four Yab-gou and called himself Wang (king)."[1]

The above indications would suggest that the Yue-chi nomads settled in the Oxus valley including Ta-hia and gave up their nomadic habits sometime about the beginning of the first century B.C. Ta-hia or the Bactrian region was previously occupied first by the Greeks and then by the

---

[1] For the above account, see Sten Konow, *Corp. Ins. Ind.*, Vol. II, Part I, pp. liii ff.; Raychaudhuri, *Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind.*, 1938 ed., pp. 382 ff.; etc.

Śakas. Sometime after Alexander's conquest, Bactria became a part of the Seleucid empire, and remained so from the close of the fourth century B.C. down to the revolt of the Bactrian governor, Diodotus I, about the middle of the following century. The Bactrian kingdom founded by Diodotus I continued to be under Greek rule till the third quarter of the second century B.C. when Heliocles, son of Eucratides (c. 176-150 B.C.), ended his rule. Numismatic evidence shows that Heliocles is the last Greek king of Bactria which was, after his rule, occupied by the Śakas dispersed earlier from the Trans-Oxus territory of Sogdiana by the Yue-chi themselves. Nearly half a century later, the Yue-chi occupied Bactria and pushed the Śakas into Kafiristan, a large number of the Scythian people having also gone to settle in the dominions of the Parthian emperors. A good many of these latter Śakas appear to have settled in Drangiana or Eastern Iran which came to be known as Sakastān (medieval *Sijistān*, modern *Seistān*).[2]

Greek rule in the Kabul region continued down to the reign of Hermaius who ruled about the beginning of the first century A.D. and whose suzerainty was acknowledged by Kadphises I in the early years of his reign. The region of West Pakistan, which was later occupied by Kadphises I and Kadphises II, had been for about a century and a half under the Greeks, the western area being conquered by Śaka Maues (c. 20 B.C.-22 A.D.) and the eastern region by his successor, Azes I (c. 22-40 A.D.). Greek rule in Afghanistan and Śaka rule in West Pakistan, where Azes I was succeeded by Azilises (c. 30-40 A.D.) who

4128

---

[2] It has also been suggested that a Śaka settlement existed there even during the rule of the early monarchs of the Achaemenian dynasty in the sixth century B.C. In such a case, the Śakas, dispersed from Central Asia at a later date, would have been eager to settle there.

was himself succeeded by Azes II (c. 40-50 A.D.), were ousted by the Parthian king Gondophernes (c. 21-55 A.D.) who was deprived of much of these possessions by Kadphises I.[3]

Afghanistan and West Pakistan were parts of Bhāratavarṣa and were dominated by the Achaemenians from the 6th to the close of the 4th century B.C. and by the Mauryas from the close of the 4th to that of the following century. Thereafter they had been under the Greeks, Scythians and Parthians before they were occupied by the Kuṣāṇas. It appears therefore that the culture of the people of these areas was primarily an admixture of Indianism and Iranism and later the Greek element became as important as the other two factors. The Parthians and Scythians imbibed this composite culture which was later borrowed by the Kuṣāṇas. How far the Parthians, Scythians and Kuṣāṇas succeeded in contributing some of their own traits to the said composite culture can hardly be determined satisfactorily in the present state of insufficient information. It is interesting to note that, although there is a controversy whether the title *Devaputra* was borrowed from the Chinese,[4] no divinity particularly associated with Central Asia and China has been traced among the plethora of deities represented on the reverse of the coins of Kaniṣka I and Huviṣka.[5] It is also interesting to note that Aśoka's inscriptions in Afghanistan were written in Greek and Aramaic respectively for his Greek and Iranian subjects,[6] while the Kuṣāṇas of Kaṇiṣka's house used Greek characters for writing the legends on their coins, even though their language is either Greek or Iranian (or a Central Asian dialect influenced by Iranian).[7] The coins issued by the Greek, Parthian, Early Saka and Early Kuṣāṇa rulers, however, use the Greek language and script and the Prakrit language written in Kharoṣṭhī (rarely in the Brāhmī script).[8] The inscription[9] of the 31st year of the Kaṇiṣka era, from Surkh Kotal near Baglan in Northern Afghanistan, recording the repairs to the Temple of the Victorious Kaṇiṣka, is written in Greek script, in a dialect exhibiting very considerable Iranian influnce. The language of the Surkh Kotal inscription may be an admixture of Iranian, Indian, Greek, Parthian, Scythian and Kuṣāṇa elements, though the inscription[10] of Huviṣka's time (year 51 of the Kaṇiṣka era), from Wardak about 35 miles to the west of Kabul, is written in the Prakrit language and Kharoṣṭhī script. This seems to show that, in the Kuṣāṇa age, the influence of Indianism was more predominant in the Kabul region, once under the Mauryas, than in Northern Afghanistan. The Kuṣāṇa coins exhibit some chracteristics of Roman money, their weight being adopted from the Roman weight standard (124 grains).

---

[3] For this section, see *The Age of Imperial Unity* (*History and Culture of the Indian People,* Vol. II), ed. Majumdar, pp. 125 ff.

[4] See F. W. Thomas, 'Devaputra' in *B. C. Law Volume,* II, Poona, 1946.

[5] See Section II above.

[6] Cf. *Ep. Ind.,* Vol. XXXIV, pp. 1ff.; cf. *Journ. As.,* Tome CCLII, 1964, pp. 137 ff.

As regards foreign influence on the pre-Kuṣāṇa art of India, it has been said, "Indications of the influence of Greek example and good taste are discernible in the domain of the fine arts, and a happy blend of Indian, Iranian and Hellenic factors lends to Maurya sculpture its high quality ; but if any buildings on a Greek plan were erected, they were apparently confined to Gandhāra. A temple with Ionic pillars, dating from about 80 B.C., has been discovered at Taxila which was half foreign and by no means an essentially Indian centre ; but the plan of the building is not Greek, and the pillars, of foreign pattern, are merely borrowed ornaments. The earliest known example of Indo-Greek sculpture belongs to the same period, the reign of Azes, and not a single specimen can be referred to the times of Demetrios, Eucratides and Menander, not to speak of Alexander."[11]

---

[7] See, e.g., Whitehead's *Catalogue*, pp. 186 ff.

[8] *Ibid.*, pp. 9 ff., 98 ff., 178 ff.

[9] *Journ. As.*, 1958, pp. 345 ff.; *Bul. S. Or. Afr. Stud.*, Vol. XXIII, 1960, pp. 47 ff.

[10] *Select Inscriptions*, Vol. I, 1965 ed., pp. 58-59.

The same authority goes on to say, "The celebrated Gandhāra sculptures, found abundantly in the Peshawar District and neighbouring regions, the ancient Gandhāra, of which many excellent examples date from the time of Kaṇiṣka and his proximate successors, give vivid expression in classical forms of considerable artistic merit to this modified Buddhism (i.e. Mahāyāna), a religion with a complicated mythology and well-filled pantheon. The florid Corinthian capitals and many other characteristic features of the style prove that the Gandhāra school was merely a branch of the cosmopolitan Graeco-Roman art of the early empire. The most competent critics are now generally agreed that the school reached its highest point of development early in the second century of the Christian era (though some scholars are inclined to assign an earlier date)."[12]

How far the Kuṣāṇas were responsible for the development of the Gandhāra style can scarcely be definitely determined. But, if they patronised the Buddhist monks who helped the growth of the Mahāyāna, people's zeal for the new faith may have been responsible for such sculptures in the sanctuaries, etc., built for them. And some of the Kuṣāṇa kings were probably primarily responsible for the erection of some such sanctuaries endowed with sculptures.

---

[11] Smith, *E. Hist. Ind.*, 1924 ed., pp. 255-56.

[12] *Ibid.*, pp. 282-83. Smith's dating apparently depends on his ascription of the accession of Kaṇiṣka I to the second century A.D.

The above analysis will show that the culture of the Kuṣāṇas was mostly borrowed. Even if they were associated with the development of Mahāyāna Buddhism and the Gandhāra art, it seems that both the movements were already there and that some of the Kuṣāṇa kings, who had Buddhist leanings, helped their progress. The monasteries built during the Kuṣāṇa age within the Kuṣāṇa empire must have been mostly due to the inspiration of ordinary pious people, so that the credit ascribed to the Kuṣāṇa monarchs may be only partially correct.

It should also be remembered that the Gandhāra art flourished in West Pakistan and Afghanistan ; but it had little influence on the Indian art at other centres of the Kuṣāṇa age such as even the nearest School of Mathurā.[13] Thus the same art did not dominate the whole empire of the Kuṣāṇas.

Similar is the case with the religious life in different parts of the Kuṣāṇa empire. The coins of Kaṇiṣka I and Huviṣka represent a large number of West Asian, Greek and Indian deities who were apparently worshipped by the subjects of the Kuṣāṇas. Buddhism may have been the dominant faith in West Pakistan and Afghanistan ; but, at Indian centres like Kauśāmbī and Vārāṇasī within the empire of Kaṇiṣka I, it was only a rival of Brāhmaṇical

---

[13] Cf. "The Mathurā artists were aware of the contemporary Gandhāra art tradition......the popularity of the Gandhāra school might have influenced the Mathurā artists on simple grounds of competition......Gandhāra influence on Mathurā art appears to be very slight, however" (S. K. Saraswati, *A Survey of Indian Sculpture*, pp. 66-67).

Hinduism. According to Hiuen-tsang, in the Kāpiśa country in Afghanistan, there were 100 Buddhist monasteries with more than 6,000 monks (chiefly Mahāyānists) while the number of Deva temples was 'some tens', and above 1000 professed sectarians, Digambaras and Pāśupatas and those who wore wreaths of skulls as head-ornaments.[14] Likewise, in Gandhāra, 1000 Buddhist monasteries and 100 Deva temples flourished in the days of Hiuen-tsang.[15] On the other hand, in the Kauśāmbī tract, there were 'more than ten' monasteries with above 3oo Hīnayānist monks and 'more than fifty Deva temples', the non-Buddhists being 'very numerous'.[16] In the district of Vārāṇasī, Hiuen-tsang found 'above thirty' monasteries with more than 300 monks of the Sammatīya school and more than 100 Deva temples with more than 10,000 adherents of vaious sects, the majority being Śaiva and the number of Deva temples in the capital city being no less than 20.[17]

The language and script were not the same in the different areas of the empire. This will be evident from a study of the Kuṣāṇa inscriptions written in the Greek, Kharoṣṭhī and Brāhmī alphabets. The Chinese pilgrim Hiuen-tsang also refers to the languages and scripts of the people of different territories.

Hiuen-tsang often refers to difference of the people of one area from those of another in nature, customs, etc. Thus the people of Kāpiśa were "of a rude and violent disposition, used a coarse vulgar language and married in a miscellaneous manner. The written language was very like that of Tokhara ; but the colloquial idiom and

---

14 Watters, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 123.
15 *Ibid.*, p. 202.
16 *Ibid.*, p. 366.
17 *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 47.

the social institutions of the people were different."[18] In the same way, about Vārāṇasī, the pilgrim says, "The inhabitants were very numerous and had boundless wealth, their houses being full of rare valuables. The people were gentle and courteous and esteemed devotion to learning; the majority of them believed the other systems and only a few of them were Buddhists."[19] Hiuen-tsang's remarks on the peoples of some other territories are quoted below.

The people of Gandhāra "were faint-hearted and fond of practical arts";[20] those of the Swat valley were "pusillanimous and deceitful...and made the acquisition of magical formulae their occupation";[21] those of Balor were "rude and ugly" and of Takṣaśilā were "plucky";[22] those of Siṁhapura were "rude, bold and deceitful";[23] those of the Hazara District were "rough and deceitful";[24] those of Punch were "daring and straightforward";[25] those of Ṭakka (Sialkot region) had "rude bad ways and a low vulgar speech";[26] those of Jalandhara "had truckulent ways and a mean contemptible appearance; but they were in affluent circumstances";[27] those of the Śatadru valley "were in good circumtances and led moral lives, observing social distinctions and adhering devoutly to Buddhism";[28] regarding Mathura, the pilgrim says that "the manners and customs of the inhabitants were good; the people believed in the working of *karman* and paid respect to moral and intellectual eminence";[29] etc. We have elsewhere noticed how Hiuen-tsang enumerates the characteristics of the people of the land between Lamghan in Afganistan and Rajauri in Kashmir and regards them as inferior people of the frontier and not belonging to India proper.[30]

---

[18] *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 123.
[19] *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 47.
[20] *Ibid.*, p. 199.
[21] *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 225.
[22] *Ibid.*, p. 240.
[23] *Ibid.*, p. 248.
[24] *Ibid.*, p. 256.
[25] *Ibid.*, p. 283.
[26] *Ibid.*, p. 286.
[27] *Ibid.*, p. 296.
[28] *Ibid.*, p. 300.

---

[29] *Ibid.*, p. 301.
[30] *Ibid.*, p. 284.

IV

FOREIGNERS AND THE SOCIO-RELIGIOUS LIFE OF PAÑCANADA

As indicated by the *Manusmṛti*[1] and the geographical sections in the Purāṇas,[2] the name Udīcya or Uttarāpatha was applied, in the early centuries of the Christian era, to the land beyond the Eastern Punjab extending as far as the Oxus valley and usually also including the Himalayan region. The Brāhmaṇas of this land are mentioned in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*[3] as engaged, under the leadership of Svaidāyana Śaunaka, in a dispute with the Kuru-Pañcāla Brāhmaṇa Uddālaka Āruṇi and as defeating the latter. According to the *Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa,*[4] the speech of the Udīcyas, i.e. the people of Udīcya, which was similar to that of the Kuru-Pañcālas, was celebrated for its purity and, therefore, the Brāhmaṇas of other parts of the country used to go to Udīcya for purposes of study. This has to be read with the evidence of the Buddhist literature, according to which the city of Takṣaśilā (near modern Rawalpindi in West Pakistan) in the Gandhāra country in Udīcya or Uttarāpatha was a great seat of learning and a famous resort of students of different parts of the country.[5]

The Jātaka stories represent Takṣaśila as a famous university of pre-Buddhistic times. In the Buddha's days, princes and other eminent men received their training at the place. King Prasenajit of Kosala, the Licchavi chief Mahāli and the Malla prince Bandhula are said to have been classmates at Takṣaśilā to which students also flocked from countries like Lāṭa, Kuru-deśa, Magadha, Śivi-deśa, etc. Among the Takṣaśilā students, mention may also be made of Jīvaka of Magadha, Aṅgulimāla of Kosala, Dharmapāla of Avanti and Yaśodatta of the Malla country. The three Vedas and the eighteen *vidyās* were taught at Takṣaśilā, the sciences (*vidyās*) including archery, swordsmanship, elephant-craft (*hasti-śāstra*), magic (*e.g. ālambana-mantra* for charming snakes and *nidhyuddharaṇa-mantra* for recovering buried treasure), etc. The students also learnt the science of ritual (*mantra*), though, in this subject, Vārāṇasī probably had a greater reputation, because students are said to have gone from Takṣaśilā to Vārāṇasī for learning the *mantras*.[6]

---

[1] II. 21; cf. Sircar, *Cosm. Geog. E. Ind. Lit.*, p. 17.

[2] See Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 23 ff., for a list of the Udīcya peoples.

[3] XI. 4.1.1; cf. *Gopatha Brāhmaṇa*, I. 3.6.

[4] VII. 6.

[5] Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, pp. 8, 28, 203.

Some Udīcya peoples, however, may have been regarded as of bad repute even in the early age. The *Atharvaveda* mentions certain distant peoples to whom fever had to be banished.[7] Here the following groups are referred to— (1) Mūjavat, Mahāvṛṣa and Balhika ; (2) Mūjavat and Balhika ; (3) Mahāvṛṣa and Mūjavat ; and (4) Gandhāri, Mūjavat, Aṅga and Magadha. Of these, according to later evidence, the Balhikas lived in Northern Afghanistan, the Gandhāris (Gandhāras) in the Rawalpindi and Peshwar Districts of West Pakistan, the Aṅgas in East Bihar and the Magadhas in South Bihar. Most scholars think that, of the Gandhāri, Mūjavat, Aṅga and Magadha mentioned in the same breath, "the latter two tribes are apparently the eastern limit of the poet's knowledge, the two former the northern".[8] But the Magadhas are mentioned in the Vedic literature generally as a people of little repute and the Māgadha (a man from the land of Magadha) is included in the list of victims of the Puruṣamedha sacrifice.[9] It is thus not altogether impossible that the other three peoples mentioned along with them had also an amount of disrepute attached to their names, though it is difficult to be sure on this point especially in view of the evidence of the Buddhist literature.[10]

---

[6] For references, see Malalasekera, *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*, Vol. I, p. 982. The *Rājataraṅgiṇī* (VI. 300) refers to a *maṭha* built by Queen Diddā (981-1003 A.D.) for the accommodation of the people from Madhyadeśa, Lāṭa Ṣauḍa (apparently a mistake for Gauḍa). The people may have been students, and it is possible that, in the early medieval period, students formerly flocking to Takṣaśilā went for study to Kashmir.

[7] V. 22.5, 7, 8 and 14; cf. *Baudhāyana Śrautasūtra*, II.5,

Beside what has been said above about the learned Brāhmaṇas of Takṣaśilā, it has to be noticed that the prestige of the Udīcya Brāhmaṇas is generally recognised in the Pali literature. Thus Fick says, "of one of the Brāhmaṇas hitherto described and conforming to the Brāhmaṇical ideal, it is said with emphasis that he belongs to the North, or is of Northen extraction, i.e. is an Udicca (Udīcya) Brāhmaṇa."[11] Reference is made to the great social prestige attached to the Udīcya Brāhmaṇas settled in Kāśi and Magadha. This must, however, be regarded as the echo of an earlier age, because the Pali Buddhist works were really composed considerably after the days of the Buddha in the sixth and fifth centuries B.C., when Uttarāpatha had already been tasting foreign occupation and was gradually being regarded as an impure land.

---

[8] *Vedic Index*, Vol. I, p. 219, note 2. Bloomfield, however, thinks that the name Mahāvṛṣa has been chosen for its sound and sense (as 'of mighty strength' to resist the disease) than for its geographical position (*Hymns of the Atharvaveda*, p. 446).

[9] *Vājasaneyi Saṁhitā*, XXX. 5. 22; *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*, III. 4.1.1.

[10] Whereas there is reference to "a bad Brāhmaṇa living in Magadha," we have also rarely mention of respectable Brāhmaṇas living in that country. See *Vedic Index*, Vol. II, p. 116.

[11] *The Social Organisation in North-East India*, trans. S. K. Maitra, pp. 212-13. Fick locates Udīcya in the Kuru-Pañcāla region immediately to the west and north-west of the Kāśi-Magadha areas. But the geographical name Udīcya can hardly be interpreted in that way. The migration of the Udīcya Brāhmaṇas to the Kāśi-Magadha territory may have been due to the foreign occupation of Uttarāpatha to which we are referring below,

The foreign occupation of parts of Udīcya or Uttarāpatha began at least as early as the middle of the sixth century B.C. when the Achaemenian emperor Cyrus (558-530 B.C.) who conquered Afghanistan and the land of certain tribes lying to the west of the Indus in the valley of the Kabul river.[12] The territories of Gandhāra[13] and Sindhu (the Punjab region), on both banks of the Indus, were included in the Achaemenian empire during the early years of the reign of Darius I (522-486 B.C.). The empire of the Achaemenians passed to the Macedonian monarch Alexander the great who defeated and killed Darius III (335-330 B.C.) and conquered wide areas of the Punjab and Sindh. Alexander left the region in 324 B.C. after having founded a number of cities garrisoned by Greek troops in the occupied parts of India; but they were subjugated by Candragupta Maurya (c. 324-300 B.C.), to whom Alexander's general Seleucus, after having probably been defeated at the hands of the Maurya a few years after he had consolidated his position in Western Asia and made Babylon his capital in 311 B.C., surrendered the four territories of Aria (Herat), Arachosia (Kandahar), Paropamisadae (Kabul) and Gedrosia (Baluchistan) in exchange for 500 elephants. The story seems to be supported by the fact that recently some inscriptions of Aśoka were discovered at a place near old Kandahar in Afghanistan.[14]

---

[12] According to Arrian, "the district west of the river Indus as far as the river Cophen (Kabul) is inhabited by the Astacenians (of the Puṣkalāvatī or Charsadda area sometimes regarded as Western Gandhāra) and Assacenians (of Swat and Buner), Indian tribes. These were in ancient times subject to the Assyrians, afterwards to the Medes, and finally they submitted to the Persians and paid tribute to Cyrus, the son of Cambyses, as ruler of their land." See Chinnock, *Arrian's Anabasis,* p. 339.

[13] According to the *Rāmāyaṇa* (VII. 113. 11; 114. 11), Gandhāra lay on both sides of the Indus and had Takṣaśilā and Puṣkalāvatī as capital cities.

The Mauryas ruled over West Pakistan and Afghanistan (excluding Bactria in Northern Afghanistan) for nearly a century. But, thereafter, Afghanistan and West Pakistan were ruled by the Bactrian Greeks (Yavana), Scythians (Śaka), Parthians (Pahlava), Kuṣāṇas, Hūṇas, Turks, etc., till the early medieval period. This foreign contact, lasting for several centuries, considerably modified the culture and social prestige of Uttarāpatha.

That some of the foreign settlers of Uttarāpatha had social systems different from that of the rest of India is indicated by the *Majjhimanikāya*[15] and the inscriptions of Aśoka. The former speaks of the land of the Yavanas (Greeks of Uttrāpatha) and Kambojas (Iranian settlers of Uttarāpatha) as having two classes of peoples, e.g., Ārya (Patrician) and Dāsa (Plebian), that is to say, the population in those countries were not divided into the four social grades, viz. Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya, Vaiśya and Śūdra.[16] The same thing is said about the Yavanas in the Aśokan inscriptions,[17] according to which there were no Brāhmaṇas and Śramaṇas in the Yavana land as there were in the other parts of the Maurya empire. Another interesting fact is that, in the inscriptions[18] of Aśoka, mention is made of the Gandhāras along with the Yavanas and Kambojas. It has to be noticed that while, on the one hand, the foreign settlers were regarded, by Manu and other authorities, as a part of the Indian social organisation, on the other, the differences of their appearances, etc., were often emphasised. Thus, the Yavanas were represented in Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya*[19] as 'pure Śūdra', and in Gautama's *Dharmasūtra*[20] as sprung from the union of the Kṣatriya male and Śūdra female, while the *Manusmṛti*[21] mentions them in the list of degraded Kṣatriyas. At the same time, a well-known story in the *Harivaṁśa*[22] and the Purāṇas represents the Yavanas as distinct, even among the foreigners settled in India, because they had a fully shaven head like the Kambojas, while the Śakas, it is said, shaved only half of their head.[23]

---

[14] Sircar, *Select Inscriptions,* Vol. I, 1965 ed., pp. 527-28; *Journ. As.,* 1964, pp. 137ff.

[15] P.T.S. ed., Vol. II, p. 149.

[16] The *Bhūridatta Jātaka* (No. 543), which may be assigned to the early centuries of the Christian era, suggests that only an ignoble custom suits the Kamboja people.

[17] Sircar, *Select Inscriptions,* Vol. I, 1965 ed., p. 35 and note 8.

Another effect of the foreign occupation of Uttarāpatha was that the people of the other parts of India began to regard the said region as an unholy land inhabited by irreligious peoples. This appears to be due to the admixture of blood between the Indians and the foreigners that must have occurred in Uttarāpatha, and also to the general popularity of Buddhism among many of the foreign settlers.

---

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 22 (R.E. V.) ; cf. Yavana-Kamboja (p. 36, R.E. XIII).

[19] On Pāṇini, II. 4.10.

[20] IV. 21.

[21] X. 42-43.

[22] I. 14. 15 ff. ; cf. *Vāyu Purāṇa*, 88. 139 ff.—

ardhaṁ Śakānāṁ śiraso muṇḍaṁ kṛtvā vyasarjayat |
Yavanānāṁ śiraḥ sarvaṁ Kambojānāṁ tath=aiva ca ||
Pāradā mukta-keśāś=ca Pahlavāḥ śmaśru-dhāriṇaḥ, etc.

[23] See Sircar, *Stud. Soc. Adm. Anc. Med. Ind.*, Vol. I, pp. 41 ff.

According to Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra*,[24] contemptuous expressions, such as 'He is a bad Brāhmaṇa', should be punished by fines, and the same rules would apply to calumnies in respect of learning, of the professions of baffoons, artisans and musicians, and of nationalities, such as 'He is a Prājjuṇaka',[25] 'He is a Gāndhāra', etc. From this, there is no doubt that the people of Gandhāra were looked upon with contempt[26] in the age to which Kauṭilya's statement has to be referred.[27]

Chapters 44-45 of the Karṇa-parvan of the *Mahābhārata* describe the bad character and customs of the people of the land called Pañcanada ('the country of the Five Rivers') watered by the Indus and its five eastern tributaries, viz. the Śatadru, Vipāśā, Irāvatī, Candrabhāgā and

---

[24] Shamasastry's ed., p. 194; trans., pp. 218-19.

[25] The Prājjuṇakas may be the same as the Prārjunas known from the Allahabad pillar inscription of Samudragupta (*Select Inscriptions,* 1965 ed., p. 265, text line 22). Shamasastry mentions *Prāṇaka* (probably a mistake for *Prārjuṇaka*) as a variant reading found in the Munich manuscript. R. G. Basak's Bengali translation recognises *Prāg-Hūṇaka* (the eastern Hūṇas) in its place (Vol. I, p. 245), though the *Arthaśāstra,* even in its present form, cannot be so late as the fifth century A.D. when the Hūṇas entered into India.

[26] It is strange indeed that, on the strength of the above passage in the *Arthaśāstra,* Buddha Prakash observes, "Kauṭilya prescribes a fine for a person who slanders or vilifies Gandhāra. No richer encomium could possibly be paid to the Indus region in ancient times" (*Political and Social Movements in Ancient Punjab,* pp. 82-83).

[27] The *Arthaśāstra* may have been composed about the close of the fourth century B.C., but contains later additions, so that the work as we have it now may be assigned to a date about the third century A.D.

Vitastā.[28] The people of the land are mentioned generally as Vāhīka or Āraṭṭa (44.7 and 31-32), though, at one place (44.44), the two names are applied to the people and their country respectively. The Āraṭṭas are once even called a Vāhīka people (44.37). The Jārtikas (modern Jats) are also mentioned as a Vāhīka people (44.10) and, likewise, the Gandhāras and Madrakas (45.8). In one case (45.36), the Madras (Madrakas) are distinguished from the Vāhīkas apparently as the worst amongst the latter.[29] In the same context, one stanza (44.46) mentions the Prasthalas, Madras, Gandhāras, Āraṭṭas, Khasas, Vasātis, Sindhus and Sauvīras together. It is said that the Vāhīkas are irreligious and impure and should be avoided (44.7); the habits of the Vāhīkas, called Jārtika, are mentioned as abominable (44.10); one should not stay, it is said, for a moment in the Vāhīka country (44.22); the Āraṭṭa country is likewise irreligious, and one should not visit it (44.32); the Vāhīkas are a people who have lost their religion (44.34); the Vāhīkas, called Āraṭṭa, should be avoided by the learned men (44.37); an Ārya should not live in the land of the Vāhīkas, called Āraṭṭa, even for two days (44.40); the Vāhīkas, who are descendants of the *Piśācas* of the Vipāśā, named Vahi and Hīka, are not the creation of Prajāpati and do not know the proper religion (44.41) ; the religion of Pañcanada was decried by Pitāmaha (45.19 and 21) ; the Vāhīkas are the dirt of the earth and the Madra women are the dirt of womanhood (45-23) ; fie upon the Āraṭṭas of Pañcanada (45-29) ; etc.

---

[28] Cf. *Pañcānāṁ Sindhu-Ṣaṣṭhānāṁ nadīnāṁ ye='ntarā sthitāḥ* |
tān=dharma-bāhyān=aśucīn=Bāhīkān=parivarjayet ||
(44.7)

pañca-nadyo vahanty=etā yatra pīlūvanāny=uta |
Ṣatadruś=ca Vipāśā ca tṛtīy=Airāvatī tathā ||
Candrabhāgā Vitastā ca Sindhuṣaṣṭhā bahir=gireḥ |
Āraṭṭā nāma te deśā naṣṭa-dharmā na tān=vrajet || (44.31-32)

[29] This is according to the *Māṭhara-Kauṇḍinya nyāya*; cf. *Brāhmaṇā bhojyantām, Māṭhara-Kauṇḍinyau pariveviṣātām* (*IHQ*, Vol. XXII, p. 314, note 21).

Some of the obnoxious habits and customs of the people of Pañcanada may be mentioned here. They used to eat beef with garlic (44.11 ; cf. 40.26) : their women, intoxicated and naked, danced on the road (44.12) ; these women had little idea about chastity and sang indelicate songs (44.13) ;[30] the people of Pañcanada took away the clothes of the visitors to their country and chased them on the road (44.21) ; they used to drink various kinds of liquor (44.27) and eat the meat of animals including asses and camels (44.28) ; they ate from uncleaned wooden and earthen plates (44.35) ; they drank the milk of sheep, camels and asses (46.36) ; they were devoid of the Vedas, sacrifices, etc. (44.45) ; in Pañcanada, a Brāhmaṇa could be first a Kṣatriya, then a Vaiśya, then a Śūdra, then a barber, then again a Brāhmaṇa, and finally, a slave (45.6.7) ; the Brāhmaṇas of the Vāhīkas, called Gandhāra and Madraka, had sexual relations with (i.e. married) members of their own families (45.8) ; in the Āraṭṭa land, one's sister's son and not one's own son inherited one's property (45.13) ; peoples of the land extending from Matsya to Kuru-Pañcāla and from Naimiṣa to Cedi, i.e. the Kurus, Pañcālas, Śālvas, Matsyas, Naimiṣas, Kosalas, Kāśis, Aṅgas, Kaliṅgas and Magadhas, knew the true religion, but not the wretched Madras and Pañcanadas

---

[30] Cf. also 40.34—

Vāsāṁsy=utsṛjya nṛtyanti striyo vā madya-mohitāḥ |
maithune='saṁyatāś=c=āpi yathā-kāma-varāś=ca tāḥ ||

(45.14.16) ;[31] just as the Easterners, the Southerners and the Surāṣṭras were respectively slaves, outcastes and mixed breed, the Vāhīkas were thieves (45.28) ; the nature of the Āraṭṭas of Pañcanada was characterised by ingratitude, robbery, addiction to liquors, incest, abusing others, slaughter of cows, etc. (45.29) ; the Vāhīkas might be made to understand a thing by beating, but the Madrakas were totally incapable of understanding anything (45.36) ;[32] etc.

In the seventh century A.D., the Chinese pilgrim Hiuen-tsang says that, from Lampāka (Laghman in Afghanistan) to Rājapura (Rajauri in Kashmir), the people were coarse and plain in personal appearance and had rude and violent disposition, that they spoke vulgar dialects and exhibited scant courtesy and little fairness, and that they did not belong to India proper, but were inferior people of the frontier.[33]

In this connection, it is interesting to note that the land of Kurukṣetra in the Ambala-Karnal region, lying to the east of the Śatadru valley in Pañcanada, was regarded as a particularly holy land in the later Vedic texts,[34] while both the *Manusmṛti*[35] and the *Mahābhārata*[36] mention the tract between the Sarasvatī and Dṛṣadvatī rivers in Kurukṣetra as the holiest in the whole country. The *Manusmṛti*[37] calls it Brahmāvarta which was even superior, in holiness, to the holy land of Brahmarṣi-deśa comprising Kurukṣetra, Matsya (Jaipur-Alwar-Bharatpur region), Pañcāla (having its capitals in the Bareiley and Farrukhabad Districts of U.P.) and Śūrasenaka (Mathura region). It is well known that Udīcya or Uttarāpatha was located beyond Pṛthūdaka[38] (Pehoa in the Karnal District), or Vinaśana,[39] literally meaning 'disappearance' and indicating the place where the holy Sarasvatī lost itself in the sands of the desert. This Vinaśana-tīrtha lies in the Sirhind region of the Patiala District. It appears that the holy character of Kurukṣetra did not suffer much down to the early centuries of the Christian era when the *Manusmṛti* and the later sections of the *Mahābhārata* are said to have been compiled; but the despised foreigners were not far away. According to the *Mahābhārata*,[40] the Sarasvatī disappeared out of repugnance for the Śūdras and Ābhīras who apparently inhabited the

---

[31] *Kuravaḥ saha Pāñcālāḥ Ṣālvā Matsyāḥ sa-Naimiṣāḥ |*
Kośalāḥ Kāśayo='ṅgāś=ca Kāliṅgā Māgadhās=tathā ||
Cedayaś=ca mahābhāgā dharmaṁ jānanti śāśvatam | ....
ā Mātsyebhyaḥ Kuru-Pāñcāla-deśyā
ā Naimiṣāc=Cedayo ye viśiṣṭāḥ |
dharmaṁ purāṇam=upajīvanti santo
Madrād=ṛte Pañcanadāṁś=ca jihmān ||

[32] Cf. *iṅgitajñāś=ca Magadhāḥ prekṣitajñāś=ca Kosalāḥ |*
ardh-oktāḥ Kuru-Pāñcālāḥ Ṣālvāḥ kṛtsn-ānuśāsanāḥ |
Pārvatīyāś=ca viṣamā yath=aiva Ṣivayas=tathā |
sarvajñā Yavanā rājan ṣūrāś=c=aiva viśeṣataḥ ||
Mlecchaḥ sva-saṁjñā-niyatā n=ānuktā itare janāḥ |
Pratirathās=tu Vāhīkā na ca kecana Madrakāḥ || (45.34-36)

[33] Watters, *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India,* Vol. I, p. 284.

---

[34] See *Vedic Index*, Vol. I, p. 169, for references.

[35] II. 17-18—*Sarasvatī-Dṛṣadvatyor=deva-nadyor=yad=antaram* | *taṁ deva-nirmitaṁ deśaṁ Brahmāvartaṁ pracakṣate* || *tasmin deśe ya ācāraḥ pāramparya-kram-āgataḥ* | *varṇānāṁ sāntarālānāṁ sa sad-ācārā ucyate* ||

[36] III. 83. 204-05—*dakṣiṇena Sarasvatyā uttareṇa Dṛṣadvatīm* | *ye vasanti Kurukṣetre te vasanti triviṣṭape* ||

[37] II. 19. The same four peoples are again mentioned in the *Manusmṛti* (VII. 193) as the best soldiers in the country, probably because they had some success in fighting against the foreigners.

[38] See Rājaśekhara's *Kāvyamīmāṁsā*, G.O.S. ed., p. 94.

[39] Cf. *Manusmṛti*, II. 21.

[40] IX. 37. 1—*Ṣūdr-Ābhīrān prati dveṣād=yatra naṣṭā Sarasvatī.*

Patiala District. Of the said two tribes, the Ābhīras are usually regarded by scholars to have been foreigners who entered into India in the train of the Śakas.[41] Elsewhere in the *Mahābhārata*,[42] in the well-known episode of Arjuna escorting the Vṛṣṇi women from Dvārakā to Indraprastha, the Ābhīras of Pañcanada are mentioned as habitual robbers, and it appears that they were no other than the neighbours of the Śūdras referred to above.

---

[41] D. R. Bhandarkar, *Foreign Elements in the Hindu Population* (Calcutta reprint), pp. 20 ff. Cf. R. G. Bhandarkar, *Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism and Minor Religious Systems*, pp. 51 ff.; also *The Age of Imperial Unity* (*History and Culture of the Indian People*, Vol. II), ed. Majumdar, p. 221 .

[42] XVI. 7. 45 and 47.

V

NORTHERN BOUNDARY OF THE KUṢĀṆA EMPIRE

The Chinese got interesting information about the Yue-chi from Chang Kien who returned to China from Central Asia in 126 B.C. At that time, the Yue-chi had their capital at Kien-she to the north of the Oxus and had made themselves master of Ta-hia which had its capital at Lan-shi to the south of that river in the present Badakhshan area (Afghanistan). As we have seen, according to Fan-ye's narration of the events of the period 25-125 A.D., the capital of the Yue-chi was the old Ta-hia capital Lan-shi which remained their stronghold down to the fifth century A.D. "In the period of the *Hou Han-shu*, the Yue-chi had settled down in the old Ta-hia country and now represented the whole Ta-hia empire, i.e. as M. Chavannes puts it, henceforward they are the Ta-hia." This is supposed to have taken place between 126 B. C. and 25 A.D.[1] The suggestion, however, that the entire Yue-chi clan was then settled in the land to the south of the Oxus or that the Yue-chi settled on both banks of the Oxus were called Ta-hia is doubtful.

According to the *Shi-ki*, 'Ta-hia is situated more than 2,000 *li* south-west of Ta-wan (Ferghana) and south of the Wei water (Oxus) .... The people have no supreme ruler ; but the various towns appoint minor chiefs. The soldiers there are weak and fear warfare; they are skilled in trading and marketting."[2] It is this people who appear to have been subjugated by the Yue-chi.

---

[1] Sten Konow, *Corp. Ins. Ind.*, Vol. II, Part I, p. liv.

According to the *Hou Han-shu*, as we have elsewhere seen, the Yue-chi "transferred themselves to Ta-hia and divided that kingdom into five *hi-hou*, viz. (1) Hiu-mi (capital—Ho-mo), (2) Shuang-mi (capital—Shuang-mi), (3) Kuei-shuan (capital—Hu-tsao), (4) Hi-tun (capital—Po-mao) and (5) Kao-fu (capital—Kao-fu)."[3] This seems to suggest that the entire Yue-chi people settled in Ta-hia to the south of the Oxus. But the *Chien-Han-shu* refers to the conquest of Ta-hia by the Yue-chi and then to the five *hi-hou* and thus seems to suggest that the five principalities originally owed allegiance to the Yue-chi king of Kien-she.[4]

Elsewhere we have referred to the locations of the above five states, as proposed by Marquart : (1) Hiu-mi = Wakhan in North-Western Afghanistan ; (2) Shuang-mi = Chitral; (3) Kuei-shuang—between Chitral and the Panjshir valley in Afghanistan; (4) Hi-tun = Parwan on the Panjshir ; and (5) Kao-fu = Kabul.[5] Marquart also identified Ta-hia with Tu-ho-lo (Tukhāra) about which the *T'ang-shu* says, "It is to the west of the Tsung-ling (Pamir) and to the south of the river Wu-hu (Oxus). It is the old territory of the Ta-hia."[6] It will be seen that all the five territories lay to the south of the Oxus. In the first half of the first century

---

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. lv-lvi.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. lvi. See note 5 below.

[4] Cf. Mukherjee, *Stud. Kush. Gen. Chron.*, Vol. I, pp. 7, 122. Kadphises I may have made Lan-shi his captial after having subdued the four *hi-hou* and assumed the title of king

[5] Sten Konow, *loc. cit.* A later writer regards Kao-fu to be a mistake for Tu-mi.

[6] Know, *op. cit.*, p. lvii ; cf. "Fo-ho-lo (Baktra) bordering northwards on the Oxus" (Beal, *Life of Hiuen-Tsiang*, p. 48).

A.D., K'iu-tsiu-k'io (Kujula Kadphises or Kadphises I) of the *hi-hou* of Kuei-shuang subdued the four other *hi-hou* and became king. "He invaded An-si (Parthia) and seized the territory of Kao-fu (Kabul). Moreover, he triumphed over Pu-ta (near Kabul) and Ki-pin (Kafiristan and the adjoining eastern area) and entirely possessed those kingdoms."[7] This description seems to suggest that the founder of the Kuṣāṇa kingdom did not rule over any tract to the north of the Oxus.

The *Hou Han-shu* goes on: "K'iu-tsiu-k'io died when he was more than eighty years old. His son Yen-kao-chen (Wema Kadphises or Kadphises II) bacame king in his stead. He again conquered Tien-chou and appointed a general there for administration. From this moment the Yue-chi became extremely powerful. In all the kingdoms they were spoken of as 'king of Kuei-shuang'; but the Han stuck to their old designation and called them Ta Yue-chi."[8] It may be noticed that nothing has been said here about the expansion of the Kuṣāṇa kingdom under Kadphises II beyond the Oxus in the north. Tien-chu (Sanskrit *Sindhu*) seems to indicate the Western Punjab or the Sind-Punjab region. The capital of both Kadphises I and Kadphises II may have been at Lan-shi in Badakhshan.

The next important Kuṣāṇa king Kaṇiṣka I seems to have been an adventurer like Ikhtiyār-uddīn Muḥammad bin Bakhtiyār Khaljī who conquered wide areas of Bihar and Bengal when Muiz-uddīn Muḥammad bin Sām and his generals were laying the foundation of the Turkish Muslim empire in North India. The earliest inscriptions of Kaṇiṣka, dated in his 3rd regnal year, have been found in different parts of U.P. and he seems to have succeeded gradually in extending his political influence over Western India including Rajasthan, Gujarat and Northern Maharashtra and also over West Pakistan and Afghanistan. Traditions recorded by Hiuen-tsang represent him as a king of Gandhāra having its capital at Puruṣapura (Peshawar), his power reaching the neighbouring states and his influence extending to distant regions, as we have seen. This shows that he ruled over Gandhāra and other territories, though even kings of distant countries were his subordinate allies. The Surk Kotal (Northern Afghanistan) inscription of year 31 of the Kaṇiṣka era referring to Kaṇiṣka's temple, suggests the inclusion of Ta-hia in Kaṇiṣka's empire. There is no proof that he ruled over any territory to the north of the Oxus.

---

[7] Sten Konow, *op. cit.*, p. lxii.

[8] *Loc. cit.*

"As he kept order by military rule over a wide territory reaching to the east of the T'sung-ling (Pamir), a tributary State of China to the west of the Yellow river, through fear of the king's power, sent him a prince or a few princes as hostage ;"[9] "when Kaṇiṣka was reigning, the fear of his name spread to many regions so far even as to the outlying vassals of China to the west of the Yellow river. One of these vassal States, being in fear, sent a hostage to the court of king Kaṇiṣka, the hostage being apparently a son of the ruler of the State."[10] The above statements of Hiuen-tsang do not show that Kaṇiṣka's dominions included any Trans-Oxus territory.

Kaṇiṣka himself admits, according to a tradition, that he failed to subjugate the peoples of the countries to the north. Before his death, Kaniṣka is stated to have said, "I have subjugated three regions ; all men have taken refuge with me ; the region of the north alone has not come in to make its submission."[11] This seems to go against the possibility of the expansion of Kaniṣka's power to the north of the Oxus.

---

[9] Watters, *op. cit.*, p. 124 ; Beal, *Buddhist Records of the Western World, op. cit.*, p. 119—"Then the tribes who occupy the territory to the west of the river (Yellow river) sent hostages to him." The hostages were kept in 'India' (Indus region) in winter, in Kāpiśa in summer, and in Gandhāra in autumn and spring. It is possible that king Kaṇiṣka also had seasonal residence in those territories.

[10] Watters, *op. cit.*, p. 292 ; Beal, *op. cit.*, pp. 207-08. The winter residence of the hostage or hostages was in Cīnabhukti in the Punjab.

There is another fact which suggests that Kaniṣka's empire extended in the north to the southern edge of the Tsung-ling range or Tagdumbash Pamir, i.e. "the meridional range or ranges which buttress the Pamir on the east and divide it from the Tarim basin."[12] It is stated that, about the year 90 A.D., the Yue-chi king (no doubt Kaniṣka I) sent a force of 70,000 horsemen under his general Si, across the T'sung-ling, to attack the Chinese general Pan-chao who had subjugated Khotan, Kashgar, Kucha and Karashahr. "The army of Si probably advanced by the Tashkurghan pass, some fourteen thousand feet high, and was so shattered by its sufferings during the passage of the mountains that when it emerged into the plain below, either that of Kashgar or Yarkand, it fell an easy prey to Pan-chao and was totally defeated."[13]

That Afghanistan continued to be in the empire of the immediate successors of Kaniṣka I is suggested by the Wardak (near Kabul) vase inscription of Huviṣka, though no inscriptions of Vāsiṣka, Kaniṣka II and Vāsudeva have as yet been discovered in that area. Thus the belief regarding the inclusion of certain Trans-Oxus regions in the empire of the Kuṣāṇas of Kaniṣka's house is no better than an unproved guess.

The *Book of the Laws of Countries* of Bardesanes (second half of the second century A.D.) refers to the "Bactrians who are called Qushani (i.e. Kuṣāṇa)."[14] This Bactria, the territory of the Kuṣāṇas, is described by Ptolemy (middle of the same century) as follows: "Bactriane (Bactria) is bounded on west by Margiane (Merv) along the side already described; on the north and east by Sogdiane, along the rest of the course of the river Oxus; and on the south by the rest of Areia (Herat) extending from the extreme point towards Margiane—the position of which is 109°—39° and by the Paropanisadai (people of the region of the Hindukush) along the parallel thence prolonged, through where the range of Paropanisus diverges towards the sources of the Oxus which lie in 119° 30′—39°."[15] The above description of the boundaries of Bactria does not include any part of the Trans-Oxus territory in it.

---

[11] *Ind. Ant.*, 1903, p. 388 ; Smith, *E. Hist. Ind.*, 1924, p. 285.

[12] Stein, *Ancient Khotan*, p. 27.

[13] Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 269.

It is generally assumed by historians that, after the death of the Kuṣāṇa king Vāsudeva (latest date year 98 of the Kaniṣka era probably corresponding to 176 A.D.), the Indian empire of the Kuṣāṇas fell into decay. But the *Wei-lio* says that, during the time of the three kingdoms (221-77 A.D., but referring to the period before 239 A.D.), "Ki-pin, Ta-hia, Kao-fu and Tien-chu were all subject to the Great Yue-chi."[16] Since Tien-chu seems to mean the Indus region, the statement seeks to suggest that, about the first half of the third century A.D., the Kuṣāṇa empire was confined to West Pakistan and Afghanistan. It must, however, be noted that the evidence of the *Wei-lio* has to be reconciled with certain known facts of history. In the 3rd and 4th centuries A.D., the Kuṣāṇas were vassals of the Sassanians of Iran. On some coins of the Sassanian king Hormazd II (301-10 A.D.), he assumes the title *Kuṣān Malkā* (King of the Kuṣāṇas) or *Kuṣān Malkā Malkā* (King of the Kuṣāṇa kings).[17] This has to be read along with the tradition that Ardashīr I (226-41 A.D.) "conquered Balkh, Khurasan and Kabul and advanced as far as Sirhind beyond the Satlaj."[18] Certain coins of the Sassanian type and fabric, bearing legends in the Nāgarī (really, late Brāhmī), Pahlavī and modified Greek alphabets are attributed to Sassanian rulers flourishing in the Indus valley.[19] The *Wei-lio* therefore refers to the period before the subjugation of the Kuṣāṇas by Ardashīr I.

---

[14] B. N. Mukherjee, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

[15] *McCrindle's Ancient India as described by Ptolemy*, ed.. Majumdar-Sastri, p. 267.

[16] *Toung Pao*, Serie II, Tome VI, Leide, 1905, pp. 538-39.

The Naqsh-i-Rustam inscription of Shāpūr I is supposed by some scholars to have been drafted in 262 A.D., while others think that it was finally revised at a later date. The epigraph speaks of Sassanian occupation of the Kuṣāṇa territory (called Kwshnhshtr = Kushanshahr and, in Greek, Kouseneon ethnos) which is said to have been bounded by Mrgw (Merv), Hryw (Herat), Skstn (Sakstān, Seistān), Twarn (located in Baluchistan), Mkwrn (Makran near Baluchistan) and P'rtn (located in Baluchistan), Hndstn ('India', i.e. the valley of the Indus), Pshkbwr or Paskibouron (identified with Peshawar) and the frontiers of K'sh (identified with Kashgarh), Swgd (Sogdiana) and Sh'sh'st'n (identified with Tashkent).[20] In our opinion, even if these boundaries of the Kuṣāṇa empire in the second half of the third century A.D. are fully accepted, they do not suggest the inclusion of any part of the Trans-Oxus country within the Kuṣāṇa territory.

---

[17] Paruck, *Sassanian Coins*, pp. 89, 281-82; Chatterjee, *The Age of the Kuṣāṇas*, pp. 111 ff. Coins with similar titles are attributed to most of the Sassanian kings.

[18] Paruck, *op. cit.*, pp. 71, 79-81. Ardashīr is generally believed to have established his supremacy over Bactria (MacGovern, *The Early Empires of Central Asia*, p. 401; Sykes, *History of Persia*, Vol. I, p. 394).

[19] Paruck, *op cit.*, pp. 98, 270-71; Rapson, *Indian Coins*, p. 30; B. Chatterjee, *op. cit.*, pp. 107 ff.

[20] B. N. Mukherjee, *op. cit.*, pp. 86, 89; cf. Mariq and Honigmann, *Recherches sur les Res Gestae Divi Saporis*, 1953, pp. 11, 94f.; *BSOAS*, Vol. IX, p. 854; *American Journal of Semitic Language and Literature*, 1940, p. 407.

According to the Chinese annals, during the reign of the Wei dynasty (386-556 A.D.), about 430 A.D., Ki-to-lo (Kidāra), a prince of the Great Yue-chi clan, separated himself from the main body and established the Little Yue-chi kingdom to the south of the Hindukush with Po-lu-sha (Peshawar) as his capital.[21] The causes of this revolution appears to be the continued domination of the Oxus valley by the Sassanians and the settlement, in the Trans-Oxus country, of the Huns who troubled the Sassanians from c. 420 to 557 A.D. In the struggle with the Huns, the Sassanian king Fīrūz I (459-84 A.D.) lost his life.[22]

About 455 A.D., the Huns invaded the Gupta empire in India, but appear to have been repulsed by Skandagupta (455-67 A.D.).[23] Even about the beginning of the fifth century A.D., Kālidāsa, in his *Raghuvaṁśa* (IV. 66-68) locates the Hūṇas on the bank of the Vaṁkṣu (Oxus).

The capital of the Huns, probably at Herat in Afghanistan, was visited by the Chinese pilgrim Song-Yun in 519 A.D. and he says that the Huns received tribute from forty neighbouring countries.[24] In 520 A.D., Song-Yun visited

---

[21] Alfred von Gutschmid, *Shahis von Kabul*, p. 196. The Paikuli inscription is said to speak of the Kuṣān Ṣah, the kings of Surāṣṭra and Avanti and twelve Ṣaka kings of the interior who had been to Ctesiphon to swear allegiance to Narses (293-303 A.D.). Cf. *JNSI*, Vol. I, p. 63; Vol. V, p. 41.

[22] Paruck, *op. cit.*, p. 101.

[23] *Select Inscriptions*, Vol. I, 1965 ed., pp. 323-24 (Bhitari pillar inscription, verse 8).

[24] Smith, *E. Hist. Ind.*, p. 335.

Kan-to-lo (Gandhāra) which was then under a Hun chief[25] We know that the Hūṇa kings Toramāṇa and Mihirakula ruled over the whole tract from Kashmir in the north to Malwa in the south about the first quarter of the sixth century A.D.[26] After the defeat of Mihirakula at the hands of Yaśodharman of Mandasor and Bālāditya of the Gupta dynasty of Magadha, the Hūṇa king's dominions were confined to the Kashmir region.[27] The Hun kingdom in Afghanistan was destroyed by a combined onslaught of the Sassanian king Khusrū I Anoshirvan (531-79 A.D.) and the Turks who had displaced the Huns from the Trans-Oxus territory and settled there. The Sassanian kings Bahram V (590-91 A.D.) and Bistam (592-96 A.D.) sought refuge with the Turks and lost their lives amongst them.[28] About 630 A.D., Hiuen-tsang found the whole region from Turfan to Merv and from Lake Issykkul to the Hindukush under the control of the Khān of the Western Turks.

The above discussion will show that the Kuṣāṇa monarchs from Kadphises I to Vāsudeva I, who flourished in the first and second centuries A.D., ruled over more or less extensive dominions, but that their successors became vassals first of the Sassanians in the first half of the 3rd century A.D., then of the Huns from the first half of the fifth century A.D. and finally of the Turks from about the latter half of the sixth century A.D.[29] Small chiefs of Kuṣāṇa extraction may have been flourishing in various parts of Afghanistan and West Pakistan and the neighbouring areas;[30] but their contribution to the culture of the region concerned must be regarded as negligible. Even if the ruler of the kingdom of Kāpiśa or Kafiristan, called a Kṣatriya by Hiuen-tsang, was a scion of the Kuṣāṇa clan, he had also nothing to do with the territories to the north of the Oxus.

---

[25] *BEFEO*, 1903, pp. 461-17.

[26] Cf. *Select Inscriptions, op. cit.*, pp. 470 ff. ; Stein, *Kalhaṇa's Rājataraṅgiṇī*, Vol. I, pp. 78-79, 82-83.

[27] *Select Inscriptions*, p. 419 (Mandasor inscription of Yaśodharman, verse 6) ; also Watters, *op. cit.*, pp. 288 ff.

[28] Paruck, *op. cit.*, pp. 108, 112-13.

[29] Cf. Smith, *op. cit.*, pp. 289 ff., 333 ff. ; H. C. Ray, *Dyn. Hist. N. Ind.*, Vol. I, pp. 56ff.

We have reports regarding the discovery of Kuṣāṇa coins in the southern part of the Central Asian Republics of the USSR lying to the north of the Oxus. Coins, however, are often seen to have travelled far away from their land of issue for various reasons, and that is why Eastern India is not definitely included in the Kuṣāṇa empire by scholars, even though many hundreds of Kuṣāṇa coins, mostly of copper, have been found in that region.[31] The discovery of a hoard of Kuṣāṇa gold coins at Dabra Dammo in Abyssinia[32] apparently indicates trade relations between India and Abyssinia in the early centuries of the Christian era and certainly not the inclusion of parts of Africa in the Kuṣāṇa empire.

In this connection, it may be pointed out that, in case art objects of the Gandhāra style are discovered in places lying to the north of the Oxus, the fact cannot be regarded as proof of the inclusion of that area in the Kuṣāṇa empire on the grounds that the Gandhāra School flourished in the region of the capital of the Kuṣāṇas. There are well-known instances of the movement of art objects, motifs and styles and of artists and artisans from one territorry to another.[33]

---

[30] Cf. Chavannes speaking of Badakhshan remaining a Yue-chi stronghold as late as the fifth century A.D. (*T'oung Pao,* II, viii, p. 187).

[31] See below.

[32] Cf. Sircar, *Studies in Indian Coins,* Delhi, 1968, p. 347.

[33] Cf. "Sculptures of Mathura style and workmanship have been

Another point that may be mentioned here is that the dynastic name Kushānou (Kuṣāṇa) has been read on the silver coins of the king named Heraus or Miaus,[34] who is therefore supposed to have been the father or grandfather of Kujula Kadphises (Kadphises I).[35] We consider this suggestion quite unconvincing, because, according to Chinese evidence, Kujula had originally been the Yue-chi cheiftain of the Kuei-shuang (Kuṣāṇa) chiefdom, and later he subjugated the four neighbouring chieftaincies and became the first king of the five chiefdoms. It is difficult to believe that Kujula's father and grandfather, who were petty chiefs, issued any coins at all.[36] Another difficulty is that the name Śaka has also been read on the coins of Heraus or Miaus. If this king was really a Kuṣāṇa (we doubt the possibility), he may have ruled over Northern Afghanistan between Vima's death and the establishment of Kaniṣka's power, or when, after Huviṣka, the Kuṣāṇas of Kaṇiṣka's house appear to have lost their hold on the said area. Such a division of the Kuṣāṇa kingdom may have happened before the second quarter of the third century A.D. when, according to the *Wei-lio*, Ta Yue-chi dominions included Ki-pin, Ta-hia, Kao-fu and T'ien-chou.

---

found in widely distant regions" (S. K. Saraswati, *A Survey of Indian Sculptures*, p. 62) ; see *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXXV, p. 200. See also below.

[34] Whitehead, *Catalogue*, Vol. I, pp. 163-64 and notes.

[35] Cf. K. Bulychov in *Sovietland*, No. 1 (226), 1969, N.P. 75, pp. 44-45 (The Search for the Fourth Empire—Soviet Scientists on the Kushan Kingdom—Head of a Kushan Prince found during Excavations at Dalverzin-tepe).

[36] Kujula issued only copper and bronze coins while Heraus or Miaus issued silver money. The Kuṣāṇas did not issue or very rarely issued silver coins.

VI

EASTERN BOUNDARY OF THE KUṢĀṆA EMPIRE

As we have seen, according to Chinese sources, the Yue-chi had their capital at Kien-she or Kien-chi in the Bukhara region to the north of the Oxus about the close of the second century B.C. when they were in possession of Ta-hia to the south of the Oxus and Ki-pin (Kafiristan together with the adjoining eastern areas) lay on the southern frontier of their kingdom. We have also seen how the territory was soon divided into five principalities each under a chief. These chiefdoms are sometimes located by scholars in the Wakhan, Chitral and Kabul regions and in the valley of the Panjshir river. It has further been mentioned that, about the beginning of the first century A.D., K'ieu-tsieu-k'io (Kusuluka = Kujula Kadphises of the coins), the chief of the Kuei-shuang (Kuṣāṇa) territory, conquered the other four principalities and became king. We have also said that he occupied Kao-fu (Kabul), overcame Po-ta (near Kabul) and Ki-pin (the Kafiristan region) and became completely master of these areas. After his death at the age of more than 80, as also indicated above, his son Yen-kao-chen (Vima Kadphises of the coins) succeeded him and conquered T'ien-chou (Sindhu = India, probably meaning the Punjab region) which he placed under a governor.[1]

The extent of Vima Kadphises' Indian possessions under his viceroy cannot be determined;[2] but there is no doubt that king Kaṇiṣka of the Kuṣāṇa clan, whose dominions included at least the whole of U P., and who had his capital or at least one of his capitals at Puruṣapura (Peshawar in West Pakistan), flourished at a later date. Inscriptions dated in the 3rd year of Kaṇiṣka's reign found in different parts of Uttar Pradesh suggest that he was originally the ruler of the central regions of Northern India and occupied the north-western parts of the Indo-Pakistan subcontinent and also Afghanistan at a later date.[3]

---

[1] See above; see also Sten Konow, *Corp. Ins. Ind.*, Vol. II, Part I, pp. xii ff., liii; Raychaudhuri, *Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind.*, 1938 ed., pp. 382ff.; *The Age of Imperial Unity*, ed. Majumdar, pp. 137ff.

[2] We do not believe that the Khalatse (Ladakh, Jammu and Kashmir) inscription belongs to this monarch. See *Select Inscriptions*, 1965 ed., p. 134 and note 2.

Kadphises I issued copper or bronze coins. On the obverse of his issues, we have the name of the Greek 'King, the Saviour' Hermaius, the Kuṣāṇa ruler being represented on the reverse as 'the Kuṣāṇa Chief', though, on his later coins issued by him independently, the ruler is styled 'the Great King, the King of Kings'.[4] His son and successor Kadphises II introduced a gold coinage of the weight standard of 124 grains or 8.035 grammes, which was suggested by the Roman *aureus*. His copper-bronze coinage is extensive. In the legend of his coins,[5] he is called *Soter Megas*, 'the Great Saviour'.

A ruler known only by his title *Soter Megas*, which associates him with Kadphises II, issued coins, a large number of which have been found in the Punjab and Afghanistan. This 'nameless' king we are inclined to associate with the 'nameless' Kuṣāṇa rulers known from the Panjtar inscription[6] of the year 122 (65 A.D.) as 'the

---

[3] Sten Konow wrongly reads the date of the Peshawar casket inscriptions as year 1 of Kaṇiṣka's reign. See *ibid.*, pp. 135 ff.; cf. N. G. Majumdar's *List of Inscriptions*, No. 60. So far the earliest date of Kaṇiṣka's reign is year 3. The Kosam inscription is really dated in that year and not in year 2 (see *Sel. Ins.*, *op. cit.*, p. 136 and note 2).

[4] According to some scholars, Kadphises I flourished sometime later than Hermaius; but it is improbable. See *The Age of Imperial Unity*, ed. Majumdar, p. 138.

[5] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 138-39.

[6] *Select Inscriptions*, p. 130.

Great King, the Kuṣāṇa' and from the Taxila inscription[7] of the year 136 (79 A.D.) as 'the Great King, the King of Kings, the *Devaputra*, the Kuṣāṇa'. The title *Devaputra* connects the said ruler with another called '*Devaputra*, the Great King, the King of Kings, Kuyula-Kara Kaphsa' who is known from the coins issued by him. It is probable that the issuer of these coins was the semi-independent governor of the Indian possessions of Vima and that this governor is mentioned in the Panjtar inscription (65 A.D.), Kujula-Kara Kadphises, probably the Kuṣāṇa ruler mentioned in the Taxila inscription (79 A.D.), being his son and successor. Kujula-Kara, and possibly also his father about the closing years of his life, appear to have ruled independently for sometime after the death of Vima and to have succeeded even in extending their power over Afghanistan. Kaṇiṣka's role in the Kuṣāṇa conquest of Northern India seems to be similar to that of Ikhtiyār-uddīn Muḥammad bin Bakhtiyār Khaljī, who was a follower of Malik Husam-uddīn Aghul-Bak, in the Turko-Muslim conquest of the same land under Muiz-uddīn Muḥammad bin Sām and the latter's general Quṭb-uddīn Aibak about the close of the twelfth century. Kaṇiṣka seems to have ousted Kujula-Kara and assumed his title *Devaputra*,[8] sometime after having consolidated his position in Uttar Pradesh.[9]

Kaṇiṣka ruled from his capital at Peshawar over a vast empire extending from Northern Afghanistan and its neighbourhood in the west to Eastern Uttar Pradesh in the east and from Kashmir in the north probably to Sind and Northern Maharashtra in the south. As to the inclusion of Afghanistan and Kashmir in Kaṇiṣka's empire, reference may be made to the Surkh Kotal inscription[10] and the tradition recorded in the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*.[11] The inclusion of the Sind region in Kaṇiṣka's empire has been inferred from the find of the Suivihar (former Bahawalpur State) inscription,[12] and that of Malwa and Gujarat and parts of Rajasthan and Maharashtra has been supposed on the basis of the discovery of the inscription of Vāsiṣka at Sanchi (former Bhopal State) in Eastern Malwa[13] and of the possibility of the Saka Satraps of Western India having originally owed allegiance to the house of Kaṇiṣka.[14]

---

[7] See *ibid.*, p. 133.

[8] We know that, according to an Indian custom, the victor may appropriate the title of the vanquished. See Sircar, *The Guhilas of Kiṣkindhā*, p. 37, note 3. The same may have been the custom of some of the foreigners. The Guhilas of Mewar, who followed the custom, are regarded by some scholars as of foreign origin. See *ibid.*, p. 6; cf. *Journ. As. Soc. Beng.*, 1909, pp. 167ff.

[9] For the above reconstruction of Kuṣāṇa history, see above; also *The Age of Imperial Unity*, ed. Majumdar, pp. 137ff.

In the east, the inscriptions of Kaṇiṣka have been discovered in Uttar Pradesh at Set-Mahet (on the borders between the Gonda and Bahraich Districts), Kosam (Allahabad District) and Sarnath (Varanasi District).[15] As regards Kaṇiṣka's relations with Bihar, there is a tradition according to which Kaṇiṣka advanced against Soked (Sāketa near Ayodhyā, Faizabad District, U. P.) and Pāṭaliputra (near Patna, Bihar) in Eastern India and took away the Buddhist scholar and poet Aśvaghoṣa from there.[16] The king of that city, who was the suzerain of Eastern India, being defeated by the Yue-chi, offered to pay 9 lakh pieces of gold ; but he was unable to collect the huge sum and gave, instead, the Buddha's alms-bowl and also Aśvaghoṣa and a miraculous cock.[17]

---

[10] *Journ. As.*, 1958, pp. 345ff.; *BSOAS*, Vol. XXIII, pp. 47ff.

[11] I. 168ff.

[12] *Sel. Ins.*, pp. 139-40.

[13] *Ibid.*, pp. 150-51. See also the Sanchi inscription of year 22, speaking of a *Rājan* named Vaskuṣāṇa who is either the same as Vāsiṣka or a local ruler under Kaṇiṣka I. Cf. Marshall, *Monuments of Sanchi*, Vol. I, pp. 278, 386 (No. 829). A large number of copper coins of the Kuṣāṇas have been found at Sanchi (*ASI, AR*, 1934-35, p. 84) and in a locality in the former Indore State (see Cunningham, *ASIR*, Vol. XII, pp. 43-44).

[14] See Rapson, *Catalogue of Coins*, p. cvi.

[15] *Select Inscriptions*, pp. 135ff., 144ff.

The Early Licchavis of Nepal used a reckoning which is now supposed to be identical with the Kaṇiṣka or Śaka era of 78 A.D.[18] The use of the era in Bihar has been supposed to be indicated by the recently published Kailvan inscription[19] dated in the year 108. Some coins issued by the Kuṣāṇas have also been discovered in Bihar and the neighbouring regions.[20] The question is therefore whether Bihar and its neighbourhood formed a part of Kaṇiṣka's empire. Scholars are not unanimous on this point, one group regarding it possible and another group doubting the possibility.[21]

Those scholars who doubt the possibility of Bihar's inclusion in Kaṇiṣka's empire may argue that the possible spread of Kaṇiṣka's era in Bihar and Nepal does not presuppose the spread of Kuṣāṇa power in those territories. The use of the Scytho-Parthian era of 58 B.C. of East Iran

---

[16] H. C. Raychaudhuri, *Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind.*, 1938 ed., p. 395. According to the Chinese translation of Kumāralāta's *Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā*, composed shortly after the reign of Kaṇiṣka, "In the family of the Kiu-sha (Kuṣāṇa) there was a king called Chen-t'an Kia-ni-ch'a (Candana or Candra Kaṇiṣka). He conquered Tung T'ien-chu and pacified the country. His power spread fear ; his good fortune was complete. He set out to return to his kingdom. The route passed through a broad, flat land." Tung T'ien-chu is regarded by some scholars as a part of Eastern India (Sten Konow, *op. cit.*, p. lxxv).

[17] See *Comp. Hist. Ind.*, Vol. II, ed. Sastri, p. 237 ; cf. *Journ. As.*, 1936, pp. 61-121. The Chinese analysts say that Kaṇiṣka subdued the east, south and west, but that the north remained unconquered.

[18] *Select Inscriptions*, 1965, p. 378, note 1.

[19] *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXXI, pp. 229ff.

[20] See below.

[21] Cf. *Journ. Anc. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. I, p. 43.

(later called Vikrama-saṁvat or the era of King Vikramāditya) seems to have been carried to the Indus valley by the Scythians and Parthians, from there to Rajasthan by the Mālavas ; and from there to Uttar Pradesh by the Maukharis ;[22] the use of Kaṇiṣka era, in the same way, may have been carried to Bihar by the Mitras of of Ahicchatra or Kauśāmbī. A branch of the Mitras, which probably migrated to the east, is known to historians as the Mitras of Magadha.[23] The Licchavis of Bihar likewise may have carried the use of the era of Kaṇiṣka to their new home in Nepal. So far as the discovery of Kuṣāṇa coins in Bihar is concerned, it may be argued that coins travel and may therefore be carried from one area to another by traders, soldiers, pilgrims, plunderers and others, and attention may be drawn to the discovery of the coins of the Śaka Satraps of Western India far away in the Akola, Amaravati, Yeotmal and Wardha Districts of Maharashtra, the Seoni and Chhindwara Districts of Madhya Pradesh and the Guntur District of Andhra Pradesh.[24] It should, however, also be remembered that the coins of the Kuṣāṇas have been found not only in Bihar, but also in Bengal and Orissa. We should not, therefore, speak of the inclusion of Bihar alone in the dominions of Kaṇiṣka or of the Kuṣāṇas, but probably of Eastern India comprising Bihar, Bengal and Orissa. This makes the problem relating to the discovery of Kuṣāṇa coins in Eastern India a subject of careful examination.

---

[22] See Sircar, *Ind. Ep.*, pp. 242ff., 251ff.

[23] Cf. *The Age of Imperial Unity*, pp. 172, 174, 214.

[24] V. V. Mirashi, *Studies in Indology*, Vol. IV, p. 233 ; also Sircar, *Studies in Indian Coins*, pp. 150ff. Sometimes it is argued that copper is a cheap metal and therefore copper coins did not usually travel far away from their place of issue. If we accept this view, the discovery of Kuṣāṇa copper coins in Eastern India would then prove the inclusion of the said region in the Kuṣāṇa empire. Copper coins are, however, known to have been the principal currency of some kingdoms of ancient India, and the copper money had no doubt very considerable purchasing power in early times. Thus the migration of copper coins from one territory to another even in the course of trade is probable.

Kuṣāṇa coins discovered in Eastern India belong to three classes, viz. (1) gold, (2) copper, and (3) imitation in both gold and copper.

(1) *Gold Coins.* We have records of the discovery of some stray gold coins only. These, however, may have been part of some hoards which were mostly melted down. The discovery of Kuṣāṇa gold coins has been reported from several places in Bihar and Bengal. In Bihar, the findspots are Sultanganj (Bhagalpur),[25] (2) Monghyr,[26] (3) Belvadag (Ranchi)[27] and (4) Bodhgaya (Gaya),[28] while, in Bengal (West Bengal and East Pakistan), gold coins of the Kuṣāṇas have been reported from (1) Mahasthan (Bogra, East Pakistan)[29] and (2) Malda (West Bengal).[30]

There are also some imitation Kuṣāṇa coins in gold from the same region.[31]

---

[25] See *Ind. Num. Chron.*, Vol. II, Part I, pp. 81 ff., Plate III, No. 1 for one coin of Huviṣka; cf. Vol. I, Parts I-II, p. 86.

[26] See *ibid.*, Vol. II, Part I, pp. 79ff., Plate II, Nos. 2-3, for two coins probably of Kaṇiṣka.

[27] See *JBORS*, Vol. I, Part II, pp. 231-32.

[28] See Cunningham, *Coins of the Indo-Scythians*, p. 10, for one coin of Huviṣka found under the *Vajrāsana*. A gold talisman of the type of Huviṣka's coins was also found here. For a gold coin and a gold talisman, cf. Cunningham, *Mahabodhi*, Plate XXII, Nos. 11 and 17. Out of the 3 gold talismans imitating the gold coins of Huviṣka, one was discovered at Kumrahar; the second came from Bodhgaya and the third from Patna city. See Altekar and Mishra, *Kumrahar Excavations*, 1951-55, p. 131.

[29] See *JPASB*, NS, Vol. XXVIII, 1932, pp. 127 fl., Plate I, No. 1 for one gold coin of Vāsudeva.

[30] See *loc. cit.*, Plate I, No. 2.

[31] See Chanda, *Gauḍarājamālā*, p. 4, for one imitation coin of Vāsudeva in base gold; see *JPASB*, Vol. XXVIII, *loc. cit.*, Plate I, No. 3, for a gold coin imitated from Kaṇiṣka's issues.

(2) *Copper Coins.* Numerous hoards and stray finds of Kuṣāṇa copper coins from Bihar, Bengal and Orissa have been reported. In Bihar, mention may be made of (1) Kumrahar (Patna),[32] (2) Basarh (Muzaffarpur),[33] (3) Buxar (Shahabad),[34] (4) Nandangadh (Champaran),[35] (5) Vatara (Darbhanga),[36] (6) Darbhanga,[37] and Karra Thana (Ranchi).[38]

In Bengal, copper coins of the Kuṣāṇas have been found at some places including Tamluk in the Midnapur District.[39] A large number of copper coins of the Kuṣāṇa type have been collected by the Directorate of Archaeology, Government of West Bengal, Calcutta, aprarently from the southern Districts of the State.[40] Some of these may be genuine issues of the Kuṣāṇa kings, though many appear to be of the imitation type.

In Orissa, copper coins of the Kuṣāṇa kings have been

---

32 See *JNSI*, Vol. XIII, Part II, pp. 144ff., for 52 coins including 2 of Vima Kadphises, 12 of Kaṇiṣka and 30 of Huviṣka ; see Altekar and Mishra, *op. cit.*, p. 99, Plate LXX-B, Nos. 20-21, for 7 coins (2 of Kaṇiṣka and 5 of Huviṣka).

33 See *JBORS*, Vol. I, Part II, p. 232, for some coins of Kadphises II. A few coins were discovered from Raja Bisalka Gadh (*Indian Archaeology*, 1958-59, p. 12). See K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute's *Report on the Vaisali Excavations*, 1958-62 (in the press), for another lot of 9 coins (3 of Kaṇiṣka, 4 of Huviṣka, 1 of Vāsudeva and 1 unidentified). See also S. R. Roy, *A Guide to the Vaisali Museum*, Part II, pp. 16-17, Nos. C 49-59.

34 See *JNSI*, Vol. XII, Part II, pp. 121ff., for nearly 400 coins (23 of Vima Kadphises, 159 of Kaṇiṣka, 172 of Huviṣka and 38 unidentified).

35 See *ASI, AR*, 1936-37, p. 50, for 3 coins of Kaṇiṣka and 2 of Huviṣka.

36 See *An. Rep. K. P. Jayaswal Research Inst.*, Patna, 1961, p. 4, for a hoard of 500 coins.

37 See *Ind. Num. Chron.*, Vol. II, Part I, p. 82 for some coins apparently collected from the Darbhanga region.

38 See *JBORS*, Vol. V, p. 78, note 2 for one coin of Kaṇiṣka.

39 See *Proc. ASB*, 1882, pp. 113, for a coin of Kaṇiṣka.

40 See B. Chatterjee, *The Age of the Kuṣāṇas*, p. 238 and note 42.

reported from Bhanjakia and elsewhere in the Mayurbhanj District,[41] Sitabhinji (Keonjhar),[42] Viratgadh (Mayurbhanj),[43] old Nayagadh State,[44] and Sisupalgadh (Puri).[45]

(3) *Imitation Coins.* Copper issues imitated from the types of the Kuṣāṇas have been found in large numbers in Eastern India, especially in Orissa. The type was characterised as 'Purī Kuṣāṇa' because a hoard of such coins was at first found in the Puri District of Orissa.[46] Later on, similar coins being discovered in other parts of Orissa, scholars began to call the type 'Oriya Kuṣāṇa'.[47] Now hoards of such coins have also been discovered in Bihar as we shall see. Thus the type should better be called 'Imitation Kuṣāṇa' in preference to 'Purī or Oriya Kuṣāṇa'.

Reference has been made above to the possibility of the occurrence of imitation copper coins in the collection of the Directorate of Archaeology, Government of West Bengal, which have been apparently gathered from the southern Districts of the State.

---

[41] See *ASI, AR,* 1924-25, pp. 131-32 for a hoard of the coins of Kaṇiṣka and Huviṣka (together with imitation coins) discovered at Bhanjakia in 1923. See *JNSI,* Vol. II, p. 123, for some Kuṣāṇa copper coins in the Baripada treasury. R. D. Banerji mentions 112 Kuṣāṇa copper and 282 imitation copper coins (*History Orissa,* Vol. I, pp. 111ff.).

[42] See *JNSI,* Vol. II, p. 124 ; Vol. XIII, Part II, pp. 69-72, for a few coins together with imitation issues.

[43] See *JNSI,* Vol. II, p. 124 ; Vol. IX, Part II, p. 107, for a few coins with a large number of imitation issues.

[44] See Cunningham's *ASIR,* Vol. XIII, p. 116, for a hoard referred to by Beglar.

[45] See *Ancient India,* No. 5, p. 97, for one coin each of Kaṇiṣka and Huviṣka together with 4 imitation issues.

[46] For the Manikaratna (Puri District) hoard, see Hoernle, *Proc. ASB,* 1895, pp. 61-65.

[47] *JNSI,* Vol. II, p. 126 ; Vol. XIII, Part I, p. 69.

Discovery of similar imitation coins in gold has been reported from Bengal, and we have mentioned above a coin imitated from the Kaṇiṣka issues and to the barbarous imitations of a gold coin of Vāsudeva. We have also referred to a number of talismans imitated from the gold coins of the Kuṣāṇa kings, which were found in Bihar. The obverse of the gold coin discovered at Sisupalgadh in the Puri District of Orissa, imitates the Kuṣāṇa motif, its reverse showing the head of a Roman emperor ; it may be assigned to the category of imitations. The coin has been tentatively assigned to the 3rd century A.D. on the strength of an indistinct legend[48] which is supposed to mention a king named Dharmadamadhara.

Imitation copper coins of the same class have been reported from the Mayurbhanj District,[49] Balasore,[50] Manikaratna (Puri),[51] Ganjam District,[52] Viratgadh (Mayurbhanj),[53] Sitabhinji (Keonjhar),[54] Sisupalgadh (Puri),[55] and Naugaon and Khiching (Mayurbhanj).[56] The Gulka and Jaugada coins, noticed by Beglar, appear to belong to the same class.[57]

---

[48] *Ibid.*, Vol. XII, Part I, pp. 1 ff.; *Anc. Ind.*, No. 5, pp. 97-100.

[49] See *JNSI*, Vol. IX, p. 107.

[50] For a hoard of 910 coins, see *ASI, AR*, 1924-25, p. 130. One of the coins bears the legend *ṭanka* on the reverse in Gupta characters.

[51] For a hoard of 548 coins, see *Proc. ASB*, 1895, pp. 63-66.

[52] *Madras Journ. Lit. Sc.*, N.S., No. 7, 1838, pp. 75-78.

[53] For a few Kuṣāṇa copper issues and a large number of imitation coins, see *JNSI*, Vol. II, p. 124 ; Vol. IX, Part II, p. 1 7.

[54] See *JNSI*, Vol. II, p. 124 ; Vol. XIII, Part I, pp. 69-70, for a few copper and imitation coins.

[55] See *Ancient India*, No. 5, p. 97, for 4 imitation copper coins found along with 2 genuine copper issues (one of Kaṇiṣka and the other of Huviṣka).

[56] See *JNSI*, Vol. II, p. 124, for a hoard of 105 coins from Naugaon.

[57] Cunningham, *ASIR*, Vol. XIII, pp. 72, 116.

In Bihar, imitation coins have been reported from the Rakha hill (Singhbhum)[58] and a village in Barabhum (formerly in the Manbhum District, but now in Dhanbad).[59]

The discoveries discussed above clearly prove that both gold and copper coins of the Kuṣāṇas as well as their imitations were in use in the markets of Eastern India, though the copper issues were the popular currency especially in Orissa. These copper coins appear to have been the regular money like the Mughul *Rupiya* of silver, while the gold coins were apparently treated as bullion meant for presentation and hoarding like the Mughul *Muhr*.[60] This explains the small number of gold coins so far discovered, although we have no doubt that most of the gold coins, discovered from time to time since olden days, were melted down at the goldsmiths' shops for the manufacture of ornaments.

The discovery of large hoards of copper coins, of which some are genuine and others imitation, in and in the neighbourhood of Orissa suggests that either the genuine coins entered into the area from outside and the imitations were fabricated by local manufacturers when the source of the supply dried up, or the coins of both the types were minted in the region, the genuine coins during Kuṣāṇa rule and the imitation issues after the decline of the Kuṣāṇas. Thus, even in the first alternative, there is great possibility that the area formed a part of the Kuṣāṇa empire.

---

[58] See *JBORS*, Vol. V, p. 78, for a hoard of 363 coins discovered from the northern slope of the hill; cf. *JNSI*, Vol. XI, p. 107. The word *ṭanka* is written on the coins in characters of the Gupta age. It was first noticed on the Rakha hill coins. See Allan's *Cat.* (*Anc. Ind.*), p. cxxii.

[59] See *Ind. Cult.*, Vol. III, pp. 727ff., for a hoard of 93 coins; cf. *JNSI*, Vol. II, p. 124.

[60] Cf. Sircar, *Studies in Indian Coins*, p. 289.

Indian literary tradition refers to Muruṇḍa rule at Pāṭaliputra about the 2nd century A. D., sometime before the rise of the Guptas in the first quarter of the 4th century.[61] Ptolemy's Geography (c. 145 A. D.) also places the Maroundai (Muruṇḍa) in the same region.[62] It is thus possible that the Muruṇḍas became powerful in Bihar even before the time of the Kuṣāṇa king Vāsudeva whose known dates range between years 64 and 98 (142-76 A. D.). The Chinese annals speak of an ambassador of the king of Fu-nan, who reached, about the second quarter of the third century, the mouth of a large river (probably the Ganges) after a long voyage from T'eu-kia-li (probably Takkola) and went up the river to the capital of the king of the Meu-luen (probably Muruṇḍa), who sent the embassy back with a present of four horses of the Indo-Scythian country.[63] This possibly indicates the continuation of Muruṇḍa rule till the middle of the third century A. D. ; but, as we shall see, Viśākhamitra's Kailvan inscription of 186 A.D. may go against the above suggestion regarding Muruṇḍa rule.

As the Muruṇḍas are believed to be Scythians, their occupation of Bihar may be explained if it is supposed that they were originally Kuṣāṇa viceroys of Bihar or of Eastern India. Mention in this connection may also be made of the fact that the Purāṇas place a king of Magadha, with an un-Indian name, in the period before the rise of the Guptas. The name is variously quoted as Viśvasphāni, Viśvasphāṭika, Viśvasphāci, Viśvasphāti, Viṣyaphīni, Viśvasphīti, Viśvasphūrji, Viśvasphūrti, etc.[64] Probably this Magadha ruler was a Muruṇḍa.[65]

---

[61] Cf. Raychaudhuri, *PHAI*, 1938 ed., p. 450.

[62] See Sircar, *Cosm. Geog. E. Ind. Lit.*, p. 140.

[63] *Comp. Hist. Ind.*, Vol. II, p. 774.

[64] Cf. Pargiter, *The Purāṇa Text*, etc., p. 95.

[65] See *ibid.*, p. 62, notes 28-29. "Of the Magadhas, the king will

The circulation of the gold coins of the Kuṣāṇa kings and their imitations in Eastern India, discussed above, raises another interesting point. It is well known that, there was practically no gold coinage in pre-Kuṣāṇa India and, even if there was, the gold currency had a very limited circulation.[66] Under these circumstances, a statement in the *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea* assumes special importance. This work refers to the market town of Ganges which was situated on the river Ganges in the Ganges country, and observes, "It is said that there are gold mines near these places and there is a gold coin which is called *caltis*."[67] We have tried elsewhere to show that the *Periplus* was composed in the early years of the ninth decade of the first century A. D. during the reign of Kaniṣka.[68] It is probable that the said gold coin, prevalent in the deltaic region of Lower Bengal according to the *Periplus*, is the Kuṣāṇa gold currency introduced in the area during the reign of Kaniṣka I. Its name, *caltis*, which has not yet been satisfactorily explained,[69] may possibly be the Greek modification of an east Indian corruption of some Scytho-Kuṣāṇa word meaning 'a coin' or 'a gold [coin].'

The possibility of the expansion of Kuṣāṇa rule in

---

be the very valiant Viśvasphāni. Overthrowing all kings, he will make other castes [kings, viz.], Kaivartas, Pañcakas (or Madrakas, or Mādrakas or Yadus), Pulindas and Brāhmaṇas. He will establish those persons as kings in various countries. Viśvasphāni the magnificent [will be] mighty, Viṣṇu's peer in battle. King Viśvasphāni is said to be eunuch-like in appearance. Overthrowing caste, he will create another Kṣatriya caste. After gratifying the gods, manes and Brāhmaṇas once and again, he will resort to the bank of the Ganges and subdue his body; after resigning his body, he will go to Indra's world" (*ibid.*, p. 73).

[66] Cf. Sircar, *Studies in Indian Coins*, pp. 2-3, 11.

[67] See Schoff's trans., p. 48.

[68] Sircar, *Studies in Indian Coins*, pp. 119ff.

[69] Schoff's trans., p. 259.

Eastern India raises another interesting problem. The issue of their own coins by the Śakas of Western India from a date before 119 A.D. and the absence of any Kuṣāṇa inscription in that area later than the Sanchi inscription (year 28 = 106 A.D.), referred to above, seem to suggest the feebleness of the hold of the successors of Kaniṣka I on the southern province of the empire ; but the Satrapal titles assumed by the Śakas show that they still acknowledged the allegiance of the Kuṣāṇa kings. The decline of Kuṣāṇa power seems also to be indicated by the rise of the Yaudheyas and others in the Rajasthan-Punjab region in the 2nd or 3rd century A.D. The absence of Kuṣāṇa inscriptions in Central and Eastern U. P. after those of the early years of Kaṇiṣka I and the rise of the Maghas of Kauśāmbī and others, from the 2nd century A.D., point to a similar decline in the hold of the successors of Kaṇiṣka over the eastern region of his empire. We have also to note that, besides the coins of Kaṇiṣka's successors in Bihar, a large number of Huviṣka's copper coins have been discovered in Orissa and some coins of Vāsudeva also in Bengal. Thus Eastern India may have acknowledged at least the nominal suzerainty of the Kuṣāṇas till the reign of Vāsudeva whose latest known date is the year 98 (176 A.D.). Like the Maghas and others, the Gangaridae of Deltaic Bengal and the Maroundai living above them in the Ganges valley probably owed nominal allegiance to the Kuṣāṇas when Ptolemy wrote his Geography about the middle of the second century A.D.

Can it be suggested that the Kuṣāṇa hold on Eastern India was maintained through the Muruṇḍas ?[70] There is, however, at least one difficulty in believing that the Muruṇḍas ruled continuously over Bihar and probably also over parts of Bengal and Orissa from the first half of the second to the middle of the third century A.D. We have referred to the Kailvan inscription of year 108 = 186 A.D. which shows that the heart of the Patna District was being ruled at that time by *Rājan* Ārya-Viśākhamitra whose humble royal title suggests a political status no better than that of the Magha kings. We have to remember, however, that, just as in the case of the records of the Śaka Satraps of Western India, neither the Kailvan inscription nor the Magha epigraphs mention the overlord of the local rulers. It is difficult to say whether there was a long drawn struggle between the Muruṇḍas and the scions of the local ruling families, in which both sides were successful in their turns. Or, was Viśākhamitra a subordinate of the Muruṇḍas ?

---

[70] The Muruṇḍas are identified by some scholars with the Kuṣāṇas. See *Ind. Cult.*, Vol. III, p. 729.

Reference may also be made, in the same context, to the discovery, in Bengal, of a number of sculptures in which distinct affinities with the Kuṣāṇa art idiom have been recognised. These sculptures include the red stone torso of a deity (probably Kārttikeya) from Mahasthan (Bogra District, East Pakistan), the Sūrya images from Kumarpur and Niamatpur (Rajshahi District, East Pakistan), the head and bust of the Buddha-Bodhisattva in mottled red sandstone from Chandraketugarh (24-Parganas District, West Bengal), the Viṣṇu image from Hankrail (Malda District, West Bengal) and a colossal head from Dinajpur (East Pakistan). The main point of Kuṣāṇa affinity of some of these sculptures is the Turkish dress called *udīcya-veśa* consisting of a long tunic covering the body from the neck to the knees (*gūḍho pādād = uro yāvat*). In the opinion of scholars, the stern economy that confines the main effect to the surface and to angles and lines is not unlike that in the protrait statue of Kaniṣka. The broad and heavy features, such as the broad shoulders, have affinities with the early Kuṣāṇa Buddha-Bodhisattva type of Mathura.

The fact that the hands of the images, whether raised to the level of the shoulder or lowered down to the hips, exhibit the elbow at some distance from the body is another Kuṣāṇa feature. The raised eye-brows of the Viṣṇu image, which is rarely noticed in later sculptures, also indicate affinity with the Kuṣāṇa art idiom. The colossal head from Dinajpur has some resemblance with the Buddha-Bodhisattva type of Mathura and with the contemporary sculptures of the Gandhāra school.[71]

It is not possible to be sure whether the above sculptures point to the inclusion of Bengal in the Kuṣāṇa empire or to the migration of western artisans or art motifs or sculptures to Bengal.[72] Their existence, however, cannot be dissociated from the problem of the expansion of Kuṣāṇa power over the eastern regions of India.

---

[71] On this subject, see S. K. Saraswati, *Early Sculpture of Bengal*, 1962 ed., pp. 11 ff.

[72] See above.

PART II

PROBLEMS OF RĀJPŪT HISTORY

I

THE KALACURI-HAIHAYA AND SINDA ELEMENTS IN THE RĀJPŪTS

1. *Kalacuri-Haihaya*

Several branches of the Kalacuri clan ruled in different parts of India during the early medieval period, the most famous among them being the Kalacuris of Northern Maharashtra and Malwa (6th and 7th centuries A.D.),[1] of Tripurī near Jabalpur (from the 9th to the 12th or 13th century A.D.), of Ratanpur (from the 10th to the 12th century A. D.) and of Kalyāṇa, i. e. modern Kalyani in the Bidar District of Mysore (12th century A.D.). A section of these Kalacuris, settled in the Rajasthan region, is mentioned in some lists of the 36 respectable clans of the Rājpūts.[2]

According to D. R. Bhandarkar, the Haihayas poured into India after the Kuṣāṇas, and the Kalacuris of Tripurī and Ratanpur were a sept of the Haihayas. He draws our attention to the Anuśāsana-parvan (153.3) of the *Mahābhārata* and the *Harivaṁśa* (v. 1868) which mention the Haihaya king named Kārtavīrya Arjuna (i.e. Arjuna, son of Kṛtavīrya). This king was also called Sahasrārjuna and Sahasrabāhu and ruled from the city of Māhiṣmatī (modern Maheśvar or Māndhātā in the Nimar region on the Narmadā). Bhandarkar further points to the claim of the Kalacuris calling themselves Haihayas and tracing their descent from the said Arjuna in their records.[3]

---

[1] Bhandarkar is no doubt wrong when he says that the power of the Kalacuris "does not date earlier than *circa* 875 A.D." (*Foreign Elements in the Hindu Population*, Calcutta reprint, p. 29).

[2] Tod, *Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan*, Calcutta ed., Vol. I, p. 87 ; ed. Crooke, Vol. I, list facing p. 98.

[3] *Foreign Elements in the Hindu Population*, Calcutta reprint, pp. 28 ff.

That the Kalacuris were essentially foreigners who probably entered into India in the train of the Hūṇas seems to be suggested by their very name which is written differently as Kalatsuri, Kaṭaccuri and Kalacuri, the last being sometimes Sanskritised as Kalicuri, a fantastic interpretation of which is also offered in works like the *Pṛthvīrājavijaya* of Jayāṇaka.[4] Some scholars think that the name of the people is derived from the Turkish title *Kulchur*.[5]

However, Bhandarkar's suggestions that the Kalacuris were a sept of the Haihayas and that the Haihayas were foreigners seem to be wrong. The fact appears to be that the Haihayas were an ancient people of India while the foreign clan of the Kalacuris, that entered into India probably along with the Hūṇas, claimed descent from the former, just as numerous medieval ruling families claimed to have descended from the solar, lunar, Yādava or Nāga dynasty.[6] The Kalacuris appear to be represented as Haihaya for the first time in the records of the Cālukya houses of Bādāmi and Veṅgī.[7]

According to the Purāṇic accounts of the ancient Indian dynasties, Yadu (7th in descent from Vaivasvata Manu, the progenitor of the solar and lunar races) had four or five sons, of whom Sahasrajit (Sahasrada or Sahasrāda) and Kroṣṭu (or Kroṣṭṛ) were prominent, and the descendants of the former were named after his grandson Haihaya.[8]

---

[4] *IHQ*, March, 1942, p. 80.

[5] See P. C. Bagchi in *Proc. IHC*, Aligarh Session, 1943, pp. 44-45.

[6] Sircar, *The Guhilas of Kiṣkindhā*, p. 5.

[7] Vinayāditya (681-97 A.D.) of Bādāmi defeated the Haihayas, and the Haihaya princesses Lokamahādevī and Trailokyamahādevī were the queens of Vikramāditya II (733-43 A.D.). The Eastern Cālukya king Viṣṇuvardhana IV also married a Haihaya princess. See *Corp. Ins. Ind.*, Vol. IV, p. xlv.

[8] Pargiter, *Anc. Ind. Hist. Trad.*, pp. 87-88.

The genealogy of the Haihayas, as found in twelve Purāṇas, says that they comprised five clans called after Vītihotra, Śāryāta, Bhoja, Avanti and Tuṇḍikera, who were distinguished members of the clan and were all called Tālajaṅgha.[9] In the historical section of the Purāṇas, Puṇika is said to have killed his Vītihotra master and raised his son Pradyota (a contemporary of the Buddha, 566-486 B. C., according to the Buddhist sources) to the throne of Avanti when the Bārhadrathas of Magadha had passed away and the Vītihotras were ruling in Avanti.[10] The same section further says that, contemporaneously with the Śaiśunāgas, 28 Haihayas and 20 Vītihotras ruled side by side with 24 Aikṣvākus, 27 Pāñcālas, 24 Kāśis, 32 Kaliṅgas, 25 Aśmakas, 36 (or 26) Kurus, 28 Mithilas and 23 Śūrasenas and that all these Kṣatriya clans were uprooted by Mahāpadma Nanda who founded the Nanda dynasty about two generations before Alexander's invasion of India (327-324 B.C.).[11]

Considering the vague reference, in the said historical section of the Purāṇas, to foreigners like the Śakas who are placed many centuries later, the above details seem to preclude the possibility of the Haihayas having entered into India after the Kuṣāṇas, i.e. many years after the entry of the Śakas.

The Haihaya king Arjuna, the son of Kṛtavīrya and the lord of Māhiṣmatī, is well known not only to the Purāṇas, but also to both the epics, the *Rāmāyaṇa* and

---

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 102.

[10] *The Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age*, p. 18—*Bārhadratheṣv=atīteṣu Vītihotreṣv=Avantiṣu | Sunikaḥ (Puṇikaḥ) svāminaṁ hatvā putraṁ samabhiṣekṣyati || miṣatāṁ Kṣatriyāṇāṁ hi Pradyotaṁ Suniko (Puṇiko) balāt*, etc. See Sircar *Ancient Malwa and the Vikramāditya Tradition*, p. 26.

[11] Pargiter, *op. cit.*, p. 69 ; Sircar, *Ancient Malwa and the Vikramāditya Tradition*, pp. 51 ff.

Mahābhārata. According to the *Rāmāyaṇa,*[12] once Rāvaṇa, the Rākṣasa king of Laṅkā, attacked the Haihaya monarch Arjuna when the latter was sporting in the waters of the Narmadā. The Rākṣasa ruler was defeated and captured by his enemy, but was released at the request of the sage Pulastya. The *Mahābhārata,* likewise, mentions the said Haihaya king in several interesting stories. In the Anuśāsana-parvan,[13] we are told how the Haihaya king Arjuna became proud on receipt of a boon from Dattātreya and began to regard the Brāhmaṇas as inferior to the Kṣatriyas. In another story in the Āśvamedhika-parvan,[14] Haihaya Arjuna is represented as having conquered the whole earth and gone to attack the Brāhmaṇa hero Paraśurāma who is stated to have defeated and killed him. The story of the carrying away of the sage Jamadagni's *homa-dhenu* forcibly by the Haihaya king Arjuna of the Anūpa country on the Narmadā and the consequent slaughter of the king by the sage's son Paraśurāma is often repeated in the epico-Purāṇic literature.[15]

Now, the *Rāmāyaṇa* is usually believed to have obtained its present extent and contents as early as the close of the second century A.D.[16] while the *Mahābhārata* is supposed to have developed into its present form during the period from the fourth century B.C. down to the fourth century A.D.[17] If the Haihaya clan and its rulers are so well known to these old works, it is indeed impossible to believe that the Haihayas entered India 'after the Kuṣāṇas' probably meaning the age of the Imperial Guptas who flourished from the 4th to the 6th century A.D.

---

[12] VIII. Chs. 36-38.

[13] Chs. 152-57.

[14] Ch. 29.

[15] *Mahābhārata,* XII. 49; cf. III. 114-16; *Bhāgavata,* IX. 15-16; *Agni,* 4-5; *Skanda,* Āvantya, Revā, 218; Nāgara, 67; etc

[16] Winternitz, *Hist. Ind. Lit.,* Vol. I, p. 516.

[17] *Ibid.,* p. 465.

Bhandarkar draws our attention to the Purāṇic story of Bāhu and Sagara.[18] The Ikṣvāku king Bāhu was deprived of his kingdom by the Haihayas and Tālajaṅghas with the assistance of the Yavanas, Kambojas, Śakas, Pāradas, Pahlavas, etc. He died at Aurva's hermitage where his queen gave birth to his posthumous son Sagara. The prince received his training from Aurva and, when he grew up, defeated his father's enemies and was bent upon destroying them. The foreigners then took refuge at the hermitage of the sage Vasiṣṭha, the preceptor of the Ikṣvāku family. The sage assured them about their safety and advised Sagara to spare their lives. Sagara therefore did not destroy them, but compelled them to change their appearance. Thus the Śakas were compelled to shave off half of their head, the Yavanas and Kambojas to shave off the entire head, the Pāradas to keep long hair, the Pahlavas to keep long beard, and the like.[19]

It is quite clear that the story was fabricated in order to explain certain peculiarities of the foreigners settled in India by suggesting that their peculiar characteristics were due to their defeat at the hands of Sagara just as, according to the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, the Turuṣkas shaved off half of their head and walked with their hands at the back as a result of their defeat at the hands of king Lalitāditya of Kashmir.[20] The fabrication was done after the advent of the Indo-Greeks (Yavanas) and Scytho-Parthians, i. e. as late as the early centuries of the Christian era. It scarcely proves the Haihayas' entry into India after the Kuṣāṇas, i.e. in the age of the Guptas.

---

[18] *Foreign Elements*, etc., pp. 28-29.

[19] See Sircar, *Stud. Soc. Adm. Anc. Med. Ind.*, Vol. I, pp. 41 ff . Cf. *ardhaṁ Śakānāṁ śiraso muṇḍaṁ kṛtvā vyasarjayat* | *Yavanānāṁ śiraḥ sarvaṁ Kambojānāṁ tath=aiva ca* | *Pāradā mukta-keśāś=ca Pahlavāḥ śmaśrudhāriṇaḥ*, etc.

[20] See IV. 17—*bandha-mudrābhidhānāya paścād-bāhū tad-ājñayā* | *Turuṣkā dadhate vyaktaṁ mūrdhānaṁ c=ārdha-muṇḍitam* || There are

We therefore do not agree with Bhandarkar that the Haihayas were a foreign people entering into India after the Kuṣāṇa age and that the Kalacuris were actually a sept of the Haihaya clan.

2. *Sinda*

The name Sinda or 'Sindoo' (Sindhu) is applied to one of the 36 respectable Rājpūt clans in some of the traditional lists.[21]

According to D. R. Bhandarkar, the Sindas were a foreign tribe that settled in the Siwalik region and came from the north to the south. He draws our attention to the Bhairanmatti (Bagalkot Taluka, Bijapur District, Mysore) inscription mentioning the Sinda prince Pulikāla, born in the Nāga race and enjoying the *Nāga-dhvaja* (serpent-banner), *Vyāghra-lāñchana* (tiger-crest) and the hereditary title *Bhogāvatīpura-parameśvara* (supreme lord of the town of Bhogāvatī which is the capital of the Nāgas in Pātāla or the nether world). It is said in the record that the serpent king Dharaṇendra came from the underworld to see the earth and from him was born the long-armed Sinda at Ahicchatra in the region of the river Sindhu (Indus). This Sinda became the king of the Sinda country, married a Kadamba princess and became the progenitor of the Sinda clan.[22]

---

several other cases of the same type. See Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 46 ff., for the Dākṣiṇātyas and the Gauḍas respectively in the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* (IV. 180) and the Haraha inscription of Īśānavarman (*Sel. Ins.*, Vol. I, 1965 ed., pp. 387-88, verse 13).

[21] Tod, *op. cit.*, Calcutta ed., p. 87.

[22] Bhandarkar, *op. cit.*, p. 47 ; cf. *Bomb. Gaz.*, Vol. I, Part II, p. 576.

Bhandarkar further draws our attention to the traditions that an early member of the Cāhamāna clan also came from Ahicchatra, while the Kadamba king Mayūravarman went to the Himalayas and, when he returned, brought from Ahicchatra a number of Brāhmaṇas to be settled in his kingdom. In Bhandarkar's opinion, this Ahicchatra was situated in the Himalayas and is mentioned by Hiuen-tsang. He thinks that Hiuen-tsang's Ahicchatra, which was "naturally strong, being flanked by mountain crags," could have only been a place in the Himalayas and not in the Gangetic plains, so that it cannot be modern Rāmnagar (Bareily District) near Badaun in U.P. It is further suggested that the name of the country, in which the Himalayan Ahicchatra was situated, was Sapādalakṣa which is the present Siwalik or Savālakh range (running parallel to the Himalayas for about 200 miles from the Beas to the Ganges), though originally "it included the Districts of Kumaun, Gadhwal, Kangda, Hoshiarpur and so forth, in fact all that part of India between the Chamba State and Nepal."[23]

Much of what Bhandarkar says about the clan of the Sindas, the city of Ahicchatra and the country of Sapādalakṣa, however, appears to be wrong.

The Sindas or Chindas were a Dravidian people of the Kannaḍa-speaking area, but settled in different parts of North India and fabricated different stories of their origin in the fashion of many other mediaeval royal families. It is true that, in some traditions, their name was Sanskritised as *Sindhu* and was associated with the river of that name.[24] But it has to be remembered that the story is not the same with the different branches of the clan. The Sindas of Karṇāṭa claimed both the Nāga and the Sindhu (Indus) origin,[25] while the Chindakas (i. e. Chindas) of Madhya Pradesh claimed Nāga origin only.[26] The Sindas of Gayā, on the other hand, claimed Sindhu origin, and a descent not from the Nāgas, but from the lunar race.[27] The Madhya Pradesh and Gayā branches of the clan thus appear to have left their original home in Karṇāṭa when the fabrication of the mythical genealogy was still in the formative stage. This seems to be clear from the history of another Chinda family of North India known from the Dewal (Pilibhit District, U.P.) inscription[28] of Lalla who was the son of Malhaṇa from Aṇahilā of the Culukeśvara (Cālukya) family, apparently a ruling house of Karṇāṭa origin. This inscription of 992 A.D. mentions Malhaṇa's father Vairavarman and elder brother Bhūṣaṇa. The interesting fact revealed by the record is that the Chindas of Pilibhit claimed descent from the sage Cyavana and not from either the Nāga or the Sindhu river very probably because they had left their original home in the Karṇāṭa country at a still earlier date.

---

[23] Bhandarkar, *op. cit.*, p. 50.

[24] *The Struggle for Empire*, ed. Majumdar, p. 215.

The above analysis will show that Bhandarkar's contention about the Sindas being a foreign tribe coming to the south from their settlement at Ahicchatra in the Himalayan region is not at all supported by any evidence and is apparently incorrect. The Karṇāṭa origin of the Sindas seems to be suggested by the discovery of their early records in that country and by their eagerness to contract matrimonial alliances with Karṇāṭa families. We have referred above to the marriage of Malhaṇa of the Chinda family of Pilibhit with Aṇahilā of the Culukeśvara or Cālukya dynasty. Reference may also be made to the marriage of Śaṅkarādevī, daughter of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Mathana of Aṅga, with Devarakṣita of the Chikkora branch of the Sinda family of Gayā.[29] It may also be noted that the names *Kanhara* and *Kannara* occurring in the Chindaka family of Bastar are Kannaḍa corruptions of Sanskrit *Kṛṣṇa* while the name of Dhārāvarṣa-Jagadekabhūsaṇa reminds us of names ending in *varṣa* amongst the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Karṇāṭa.[30]

---

[25] *Bomb. Gaz., op. cit.,* pp. 572ff. ; Sewell, *Hist. Ins. S. Ind.,* pp. 214ff. ; *Ep. Ind.,* Vol. II, pp. 230ff.

[26] *The Struggle for Empire,* pp. 214ff.

[27] Cf. *Ep. Ind.,* Vol. XXXV, p. 82, note 1 ; Sircar, *Stud. Soc. Adm. Anc. Med. Ind.,* Vol. I, pp. 137-38.

[28] Bhandarkar's List of Inscriptions, No. 92.

As regards the location of Ahicchatra, the Bijholi inscription[31] seems to place it in the Sambhar region in the western part of the Jaipur Division and its neighbourhood. Verses 10-12 of the said inscription read as follows—

Śrī-Cāhamāna-kṣitirāja-vaṁśaḥ
paurvo = 'py = apūrvo na jaḍ-āvanaddhaḥ |
bhinno na c = āṁgo na ca raṁdhra-yukto
no niṣphalaḥ sāra-yuto nato no || 10
lāvaṇya-nirmala-mahojjvalit-āṁga-yaṣṭir =
acch-occhalac-chuci-payaḥ-paridhāna-dhātrī |
uttuṁga-parvata-payodhara-bhāra-bhugnā
*Śākambhar = ājani jan = īva tato = 'pi Viṣṇoḥ ||*11
vipraḥ Śrī-Vatsa-gotre = 'bhūd = Ahicchatrapure purā |
*Sāmaṁto = 'naṁta-sāmaṁtaḥ Pūrṇṇatallo nṛpas = tataḥ ||*12[32]

---

[29] Cf. Sircar, *Stud. Soc. Adm. Anc. Med. Ind.*, Vol. I, p. 137.

[30] See Bhandarkar's List, p. 395; Sircar, *Stud. Geog. Anc. Med. Ind.*, p. 251.

[31] See *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXV, pp. 84ff.

[32] *Ibid.*, p. 103. Bhandarkar seems to have misunderstood the evidence of this record. The comparison of a dynasty (*vaṁśa*) with a bamboo (*vaṁśa*), found in verse 10 quoted, is also noticed in another

The above stanzas first introduce the Cāhamāna royal family, then the Śākambharā (Śākambhrī) territory which became the mother, as it were, of Viṣṇu (i.e. Vāsudeva, the earliest king of the Cāhamāna family) and finally speak of the Brāhmaṇa chief Ananta born in the Vatsa or Śrīvatsa *gotra* at Ahicchatrapura and also of his successor Pūrṇatalla. This suggests that the city of Ahicchatra, associated with the Cāhamāna family, was situated not in the Himalayas, but in the region around the Sambhar lake, standing on the borders of the Jaipur and Jodhpur Divisions of Rajasthan.[33] Sambhar was the name of a Nizamat in the Sekhawati region of the old Jaipur State and the goddess Śākambharī is still worshipped in a temple at Sakrai about 20 miles from Raghunathgarh in the said area.

The above conclusion further suggests that the location of Sapādalakṣa in the Jaipur area and its identification with the Cāhamāna kingdom, as suggested by epigraphic records, is justifiable.[34] The Cāhamāna kingdom is often mentioned as the Śākambharī or Sapādalakṣa country and

---

epigraph from Rajasthan. The Ajmer inscription (12th century A.D.) has the following stanzas—

> *Tasmāt=samālambana-daṇḍa-yonir=*
> *abhūj=janasya skhalataḥ sva-mārgāt* |
> *vaṁśaḥ sad=aiv=oḍha-raso nṛpāṇāṁ*
> *anudgat-aino-ghuṇa-kīṭa-randhraḥ* || 34
> *Samutthito='rkād=anaraṇya-yonir=*
> *utpanna-punnāga-kadamba-śākhaḥ* |
> *āścaryam=antaḥ-prasarat-kuśo='yaṁ*
> *vaṁśo='rthināṁ śrīphalatāṁ prayāti* || 35

(*Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXIX, p. 182). There are also other instances.

[33] Cf. *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXV, pp. 88-89; see Ray, *DHNI*, Vol. II, p. 1054.

[34] Cf. Ray, *op. cit.*, pp. 1060 ff.

one of the kings of this family is called 'the Sapādalakṣīya *Rājā* of Śākambharī.'[35]

The name Sapādalakṣa means that the territory consisted of one lakh and a quarter *grāmas* (the real meaning of the word being doubtful) and reminds us of such names as Pādonalakṣa applied to the kingdom of the Jajapellas of Narwar,[36] while the number of 'one lakh and a quarter' *grāmas* is known to have been allotted not only also to the Nizamabad-Karimnagar region of Andhra Pradesh,[37] but to no less than seven other tracts in a Purāṇic list of 72 countries, e.g., (1) Purasāhaṇaka, (2) Narendu (Varendra), (3) Atilā(jā)ṅgala, (4) Sayambhara (Śākambhara), (5) Mevāḍa, (6) Karnāṭa and (7) Yugala or Puṅgala.[38] The territories in the Karṇāṭa region were generally mentioned along with a number, e.g. Gaṅgavāḍi 96000, Kuknūr 30, etc., and the influence of this custom in noticed is Western India in geographical names like Aṅkottaka-caturaśīti (Ankottaka-84), etc.[39] There is little doubt that Sapādalakṣa was the name of the Cāhamāna kingdom in the Jaipur region and that it does not appear to have had any particular significance as Bhandarkar believes. Sapādalakṣa is also the same as Siwalik or Savālakh, though this name seems to be based on a tradition that the range had 125,000 hills or peaks. In the present state of our knowledge, it is not possible to associate the Cāhamānas with the Siwalik range.[40]

Two inscriptions from Gayā in Bihar mention king Aśokacalla or Aśokavalla as the lord of Sapādalakṣa kings and as the overlord of Puruṣottamasiṁha of the Kāma country.[41] Bhandarkar identifies the Kāma country with Kumāun on the grounds that another inscription of this king has been found in Gadhwal. Unfortunately, no such Gadhwal inscription is known and the Kāma territory may be identified with the district round Kāmān near Bharatpur.

---

[35] *Ibid.*, p. 937.

[36] Sircar, *Stud. Geog. And. Med. Ind.*, p. 204, note 3.

[37] *Ibid.*, pp. 201 ff.

[38] *Ibid.*, p. 204, note 3.

[39] *Ibid.*, p. 198.

[40] Ray, *DHNI*, Vol. II, p. 1054, note 1 ; cf. p. 939, note 3.

While there is an inscription saying that Kadamba Mayūravarman established his power on the summit of the Himavat mountain, the Kargudari epigraph of the Hangal Kadambas states that Mayūravarman came from the Himalayas and brought from Ahicchatra eighteen Brāhmaṇas for settling them in the Kuntala (Karṇāṭa) country. These late traditions are certainly of no historical value.[42] We have similar stories regarding the migration of Brāhmaṇas to Bengal and Tamil Nadu from centres of learning in U. P. such as Kānyakubja and Kolāñca (Kroḍāñca) in the case of Bengal and Kuśasthalī (Kuśasthala or Kānyakubja) lying in the Antarvedi territory in the case of Tamil Nadu.[43] Just as Ahicchatra was the capital of the Pañcāla country in ancient times, Kānyakubja was regarded as the capital of the said country in the early medieval period.[44] The settlement of a large number of Śrāvasti Brāhmaṇas in the Hili-Balurghat region of North Bengal led to the change of the name of the area from Pāhuniyojana to Śrāvasti.[45] It is easier to believe that such centres of learned Brāhmaṇas were in the plains of U. P. and not in the hills. Indeed a hill-station as the seat of learned Brāhmaṇas is unknown in the history of Indian social life. Thus Ahicchatra should better be identified with Rāmnagar near Bareily and need not be placed in the Himalayas.

---

[41] *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. X, pp. 342-46.

[42] See *The Successors of the Sātavāhanas*, p. 227.

[43] See the stories of Ādiśūra and Arindama in *Stud. Soc. Adm. Anc. Med. Ind.*, Vol. I, p. 29.

[44] Sircar, *Cosm. Geog. E. Ind. Lit.*, p. 71 ; cf. p. 168.

[45] *Stud. Soc. Adm. Anc. Med. Ind.*, *op. cit.*, pp. 20-21.

Bhandarkar thinks that the Nagara- or Nāgara-Brāhmaṇas of Gujarat, to whose clan he assigns the Guhila dynasty of Mevāḍ,[46] received their name from Nagar or Nagarkoṭ in the Siwalik hills (the city being, in his opinion, in the neighbourhood of Ahicchatra) and that they settled in Gujarat in large numbers at modern Vaḍnagar (often Sanskritised as Vaṭanagara or Vṛddhanagara). He is inclined to identify the Nagara- or Nāgara-Brāhmaṇas of Gujarat, Mysore, and Nepal and the divisions named Nāgara, Nagarī or Nagarīā among the Kashmiri, Kanaujia and Maithil Brāhmaṇas.[47] The suggestion is, however, based on the wrong assumption that there was only one Indian city named Nagar in the ancient and medieval periods. There is some evidence to prove that such was not the case. Pāṭaliputranagara was called Nagara or Śrīnagara,[48] while the name of the present village of Nagar near Uniyara in the Tonk District of Rajasthan is, likewise, the *nām-aikadeśa* of the ancient name Mālava-nagara.[49] The city of Nagarahāra in the eastern fringe of Afghanistan was another Nagara. The Greek geographer Plolemy calls it Nagara or Dionysopolis (i. e. the city of Dionysus),[50] while the Chinese pilgrim Fa-hien calls it Na-kie Nagara),[51] though Hiuen-tsang gives the name as Na-kie-lo-ho (Nagarahāra).[52] In the lexicon

---

[46] *JASB*, 1909, pp. 181 ff.
[47] *Op cit.*, pp. 61 ff.
[48] *Cosm. Geog. E. Ind. Lit.*, p. 107.
[49] *The Age of Imperial Unity*, p. 164, note 2.
[50] Cf. Sircar, *Cosm. Geog. E. Ind. Lit.*, p. 128.
[51] Law, *Hist. Geog. Anc. Ind.*, p. 113.
[52] See Sircar, *Cosm.*, etc., p. 151.

Kalpadrukośa, Nagara is given as another name of the town called Vṛddhanagara at Siddhapura.[53] We have also to note the name of Śrīnagara or Śrīnagarī, the capital of Kashmir, which is often mentioned as Nagara.[54] Kaliṅga-nagara, capital of Kaliṅga, appears to be mentioned as Nagara in certain Gaṅga inscriptions.[55] In the same way, Purī in Orissa is an abbreviation of Puruṣottama-purī or Jagannātha-purī,[56] and Madhyamikā-nagarī is modern Nagarī near Citoḍgaḍh.[57] Thus all the Nāgaras need not be assigned to the same Nagara identified by Bhandarkar with Nagarkoṭ.

---

[53] *Ibid.*, p. 107.

[54] Stein, *Kalhaṇa's Rājataraṅgiṇī*, Vol. II, p. 442, note 13.

[55] Cf. Śrīpura (*loc. cit.*). Likewise, Śaṅkarapattana later came to be known as Pattana (*Rājat.*, V. 213). See *The Bhārata War and Purāṇic Genealogies*, ed. Sircar, p. 112, note 21, for Nagara=Kaliṅganagara.

[56] *Cosm. Geog. E. Ind. Lit.*, p. 162, note 21 ; *Stud. Geog. Anc. Med. Ind.*, p. 193.

[57] *Cosm. Geog. E. Ind. Lit., loc. cit.*

II

THE HŪṆA AND NĀGARA-BRĀHMAṆA ELEMENTS

1. *Hūṇa*

Kālidāsa's *Raghuvaṁśa*[1] (4th or 5th century A.D.) speaks of the Hūṇas as settled on the bank of the Vaṁkṣu or Oxus, while the Junagadh inscription[2] (455-57 A.D.) of Skandagupta (455-67 A D.) refers to the king's anxiety in selecting an efficient governor for Surāṣṭra (Kathiawar) and the Bhitari pillar inscription[3] of the same king mentions his struggle with the Hūṇas. Skandagupta therefore may have repulsed a Hūṇa invasion of the western part of the Gupta empire. A Mandasor inscription[4] (c. 532 A.D.) of the Aulikara king Yaśodharman Viṣṇuvardhana of West Malwa speaks of Hūṇa rule in that region before his own rise and to the still earlier Gupta occupation of the West Malwa area. Thus Gupta rule in West Malwa had been overthrown by the Hūṇas who were driven out by the said Aulikara king. The same inscription further speaks of Yaśodharman's victory over Toramāṇa's son, the Śaiva king Mihirakula,[5] apparently the Hūṇa king Gollas mentioned in the work (547 A.D.) of Cosmas Indicopleustes.[6] As a result of Mihirakula's defeat, it is said, his rule came to be confined to the Himalayan region. That Mihirakula was a devotee of Śiva is also indicated by his coins bearing the representation of the bull and the legend *jayatu Vṛṣaḥ*, 'Victorious be the Bull (Śiva).'[7] The 7th century Chinese pilgrim Hiuen-tsang speaks of Mihirakula as having his capital at Śākala (Sialkot in West Pakistan) and as having been defeated and imprisoned by the Buddhist king Bālāditya of Magadha.[8] The grammar of Candragomin seems to refer to the Gupta victory over the Hūṇas in the 5th or 6th century.[9] The forces of the Maukhari feudatories of the Guptas appear to have fought on Bālāditya's side.[10] The Eran inscriptions[11] of Mātṛviṣṇu and Dhanyaviṣṇu, the Gwalior inscription[12] of Mihirakula and the Mandasor inscription of Yaśodharman referred to above suggest that Toramāṇa and his son ruled about the first quarter of the 6th century A.D. Both Toramāṇa and Mihirakula are mentioned in the distorted account of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*[13] as ancient kings of Kashmir.

---

[1] IV. 67-68.

[2] Sircar, *Select Inscriptions,* 1965 ed., pp. 309-10, verses 7 ff.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 323, verses 8.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 419, verse 4—

Ye bhuktā Gupta-nāthair=nna sakala-vasudh-ākrānti-
dṛṣṭa-pratāpair=
nn=ājñā Hūṇ-ādhipānāṁ kṣitipati-mukuṭ-āddhyāsinī yān=
praviṣṭā |
deśāṁs=tān=dhanva-śaila-druma-gahana-sarid vīra-bāh-
ūpagūḍhān=
vīry-āvaskanna-rājñaḥ sva -gṛha-parisar-āvajñayā yo bhunakti ||

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 419, verse 6—

Sthāṇor=anyatra yena praṇati-kṛpaṇatāṁ prāpitaṁ n=
ottam-āṅgaṁ
yasy=āśliṣṭo bhujābhyāṁ vahati Himagirir=durga-sábd-
ābhimānam |

That the Hūṇas were an important force in the political and social life of the Punjab, Rajasthan, Malwa and Gujarat

---

nīcais=ten=āpi yasya praṇati-bhuja-bal-āvarjjana-
kliṣṭa-mūrdhnā
cūḍā-puṣp-opahārair=Mihirakula-nṛpeṇ=ārccitaṁ
pāda-yugmam ||

[6] Smith, *E. Hist. Ind.*, 1924, p. 336.

[7] Sircar, *Stud. Ind. Coins*, p. 376, Pl. XIII/15.

[8] Watters, *Yuan Chwang's Travels in India*, Vol. I, p. 288.

[9] Thakur, *The Hūṇas in India*, pp. vii-viii. Candragomin illustrates *laṅ* or the Imperfect Tense by the sentence *ajayajjapto Hūṇān* in which °*jjapto* has been supposed to be a mistake for °*j=Jarto* or °*d=Gupto*, the second of the two being more probable.

[10] *Ibid.*, p. vii.

[11] *Select Inscriptions, op. cit.*, pp. 334 ff., 420 ff.

[12] *Ibid.*, pp. 424 ff.

[13] I. 289 ff.; III. 102 ff.

regions during the early medieval period is clear from their mention in a large number of literary and epigraphical records. Bāṇa's *Harṣacarita*[14] describes Prabhākaravardhana (c. 580-605 A. D.) of Thaneswar as 'the lion to the deer that were the Hūṇas', while his eldest son Rājyavardhana is described as fighting with the Hūṇa archers in Uttarāpatha (the tract of land beyond the Eastern Punjab) near the Himalayas.

King Devapāla (c. 810-50 A.D.) of the Pāla dynasty of Eastern India claimed to have humbled the Hūṇas,[15] while a Hūṇa contingent formed a part of the Pāla army for several centuries.[16] A copper-plate inscription[17] of 899 A.D., from Una near Junagadh in the Kathiawar region of Gujarat, mentions the Cālukya chief Balavarman, who owed allegiance to the Gurjara-Pratihāras of Kanauj, as having killed Jajjapa and other kings and 'freed the earth from the Hūṇa race'. An inscription[18] of the Paramāra king Vākpati II Muñja (973-96 A.D.) of Malwa refers to the Hūṇa-maṇḍala as part of his kingdom, while traditions credit his father, king Sīyaka II, and his younger brother, king Sindhurāja (996-1000 A.D.), with victory over the Hūṇas.[19] An inscription[20] from Ajmer, dated 1153 A.D., speaks of a Hūṇa royal family.

The merger of the Hūṇas, in the Indian society apparently as Kṣatriyas is indicated by a number of epigraphic records. The Guhila king Allaṭa of Medapāṭa (Mevāḍ) married Hariyādevī who was the daughter of a Hūṇa king, as stated in the Atpur inscription[21] of 977 A.D. According to Hemacandra, Cālukya Durlabha of Gujarat, who ascended the throne in 1009-1010 A.D., won Durlabhadevī in a *svayaṁvara*, but had to fight with the rival claimants for Durlabhadevī's hands, including the king of the Hūṇa country.[22] The Khairha plates[23] (1072 A.D.) of Kalacuri Yaśaḥkarṇa mention Āvalladevī, queen of king Karṇa (1041-71 A.D.), as born in the Hūṇa clan.

---

[14] See trans. Cowell and Thomas, Indian reprint, pp. 101, 132.

[15] Maitreya, *Gauḍalekhamālā*, p. 74, verse 13—*utkīlit-Otkala-kulaṁ hṛta-Hūṇa-garvaṁ kharvīkṛta-Draviḍa-Gurjjara-nātha darppaṁ.*

[16] Sircar, *Stud. Soc. Adm. Anc. Med. Ind.*, Vol. I, pp. 135-36.

[17] Bhandarkar's List of Inscriptions, No. 41.

[18] *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXIII, p. 108, text lines 7-8.

[19] *Navasāhasāṅkacarita,* X. 14 and 90; *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. I, p. 235, verse 16.

[20] Bhandarkar's List, No. 289.

Under the above circumstances, it is no wonder that the name Hūṇa is applied to one of the 36 respectable Rājpūt clans in some of the traditional lists. Out of the 4 traditional lists of the 36 clans quoted by Tod, two (quoted from 'Ancient Manuscripts' and the *Kumāracaritra*) mention the name as 'Hun or Hoon' and two (quoted from Cand Bardāi's *Pṛthvīrājarāso* and 'Kheechee Bard by name Mogje') as 'Hool.'[24] This is apparently due to the fact that, in the medieval alphabets of Northern India, often the form of *ṇ* (cf. *Hūṇa*) closely resembled that of *l* (cf. *Hūla*).

Unfortunately, uncritical attempts have been made by some writers, eager to credit the Rājpūts with the purity of blood they claimed, to prove that *Hūla* (and not *Hūṇa*) is the correct reading in the *Pṛthvīrājarāso*, and our attention is drawn to the fact that the clan name Hūla is still current in Marwar.[25] This, however, is obviously a puristic attempt to disprove what is quite evident, and scarcely deserves to be seriously considered. It is probable that the Rājpūt tribe now called Hūla are the modern representatives of the medieval Hūṇas.

---

[21] *Ibid.*, No. 85.

[22] Ray, *DHNI*, Vol. II, pp. 945-46.

[23] Bhandarkar's List, No. 1227.

[24] *Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan*, Calcutta ed., Vol. I, p. 87; cf. Bhandarkar, *Foreign Elements in the Hindu Population*, Calcutta reprint, p. 33.

2. *Nāgara-Brāhmaṇa*

As we have seen, D. R. Bhandarkar tried to prove that the Guhilas of Mevāḍ belonged to the stock of the Nāgara-Brāhmaṇas of Gujarat, who entered India, in his opinion, along with the Maitrakas (who later became the rulers of Valabhī, i. e. modern Valā near Bhavanagar in Kathiawar, Gujarat), about the close of the fifth century A.D. in the train of the Hūṇas.[26] We have also seen how his suggestion that the Nagara- or Nāgara-Brāhmaṇas received their name from that of their early home at Nagar, i. e. Nagarkoṭ, is not at all convincing. Bhandarkar further drew our attention to the thirteen family names (called *śarman* in the Gujarat-Maharashtra region) of the Nāgaras, viz. Datta, Gupta, Nanda, Ghoṣa, Śarmā (Śarman), Dāsa, Varmā (Varman), Nāgadatta, Trātā (Trātṛ), Bhūta, Mitra, Deva and Bhava, and to the fact that no less than ten of the above thirteen cognomens are found among the Kāyasthas of Bengal, e. g. Datta, Gupta, Nandī (Nanda), Ghoṣa, Śarmā (Śarman), Dāsa, Varmā (Varman), Bhūta, Mitra and

---

[25] C.V.Vaidya, *History of Medieval Hindu India*, Vol. II, 1924, p. 26 ; cf. U. Thakur, *The Hūṇas in India*, p. 238. Equally uncritical is their criticism of the theory of foreign origin of the Gurjaras proposed by scholars like D. R. Bhandarkar. See Vaidya, *op. cit.*, p. 13 ; Thakur, *op. cit.*, p. 241 ; cf. Bhandarkar, *Foreign Elements*, *loc. cit.*; also R. C. Majumdar, *JIH*, Vol. XLV, Part III, December, 1967, pp. 829-30.

[26] See Bhandarkar, *op. cit.*, pp. 57; cf. also Bhandarkar's paper in *JASB*, 1909.

Deva.[27] Since the Śrīmāla-Brāhmaṇas of Marwar have also nine of these cognomens (e. g. Nanda, Trātaka or Trātṛka, Mitra, Bhūta, Dāsa, Gupta, Ghoṣa, Datta and Deva), Bhandarkar concludes that "the Nāgara and Śrīmālī Brāhmaṇas and the Bengal Kāyasthas originally belonged to the same race."[28]

Another suggestion offered by Bhandarkar is that these family names "cannot possibly be, in all cases, mere name-endings." "For the name-endings that we generally meet with are the names of gods, such, e. g., in *Maṇiśaṅkar*, or some terms descriptive of being devotees of those gods, such, e. g., in *Ambādās*."[29] He further argues that, if these cognomens are mere name-endings, it is inconceivable how Varman (Varmā) could have found a place in the list of Nāgara-Brāhmaṇa family names, for *Varman* (*Varmā*) is a suffix attached to the names of Kṣatriyas only. Bhandarkar therefore concludes, "at least ten of these *śarmans* (family names) represent the names of families or tribes that were incorporated into the Nāgara Brāhmaṇa caste." Following the same line of argument, Bhandarkar further observes, "Mitra, one of the *śarmans* (family names) among the Nāgara Brāhmaṇas, really represents one of such tribes or clans amalgamated into the caste. And we have already seen that the Nāgara Brāhmaṇas first came to notice during the rule of the Valabhī kings who were Maitrakas. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion, as I have stated elsewhere, that Maitraka and Mitra denote one and the same tribe."[30]

---

[27] *Foreign Elements in the Hindu Population, loc. cit.* Nanda and Nandī (Nandin) are really not the same, the former being a family name among the Brāhmaṇas of Bengal.

[28] *Ibid.*, p. 60, note 148 ; cf. p. 61.

[29] *Ibid.*, p. 59.

[30] *Ibid.*, p. 61.

It is a matter of regret that we are inclined to disagree with all the above views expressed by Bhandarkar. In our opinion, all the family names quoted above are stereotyped name-endings.[31]

The tendency to distinguish persons belonging to different *varṇas* or social grades by their names developed gradually. According to the *Manusmṛti*[32] which may be assigned to a date before the rise of the Imperial Guptas in the fourth century A.D., an *upapada* suggestive of *śarman* (happiness), *rakṣā* (protection), *puṣṭi* (prosperity) and *preṣya* (service) has to be added respectively to the names of the Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya, Vaiśya and Śūdra *varṇas*. This later developed into the prescription to suffix the words *śarman* or *deva* to the name of the Brāhmaṇa, *varman* (*varmā*) and *trātṛ* (*trātā*) to that of the Kṣatriya, *bhūti* and *datta* to the Vaiśya's name and *dāsa* to the name of the Śūdra.[33]

Although the tendency of coining names of the members of one family with the same ending was not quite unknown even in the pre-Christian age, family names of the types suggested by the *Manusmṛti* and later works of that class for the different *varṇas* took a long time to be the general fashion. Thus Mitra was a popular name-ending with the

---

[31] See Sircar, *Indian Epigraphy*, pp. 422 ff.

[32] II. 31-32—

maṅgalyaṁ Brāhmaṇasya syāt=Kṣatriyasya bal-ānvitam |
Vaiśyasya dhana-saṁyuktaṁ Ṣūdrasya tu jugupsitam ||
śarmavad=Brāhmaṇasya syād=rājño rakṣā-samanvitam |
Vaiśyasya puṣṭi-saṁyuktaṁ Ṣūdrasya praiṣya-saṁyutam ||

[33] Cf. *śarm-āntaṁ Brāhmaṇasya syād=varm-āntaṁ Kṣatriyasya ca |*
gupta-dās-āntakaṁ nāma praśastaṁ Vaiśya-Ṣūdrayoḥ ||
(dhan-āntaṁ c=aiva Vaiśyasya dās-āntaṁ c=Āntyajanmanaḥ ||)
śarmā devaś=ca Viprasya varmā trātā ca Bhūbhujaḥ |
bhūtir=dattaś=ca Vaiśyasya dāsaḥ Ṣūdrasya kārayet ||
(quoted in the *Ṣabdakalpadruma*, s.v. *gupta, dāsa, varmā, śarmā*).

See Sircar, *The Successors of the Sātavāhanas*, pp. 197 note, 211 note; Kane, *Hist. Dharm.*, Vol. II, Part I. pp. 250-51.

Brāhmaṇa dynasty of the Śuṅgas (c. 187-75 B. C.) and of the kings of Ahicchatra and Kauśāmbī, who flourished shortly before and after the Christian era, while, from about the beginning of the fourth century A D., the Pallava kings, who were Brāhmaṇas of the Bhāradvāja-gotra, had names ending in *varman.*[34] A person of the mercantile community seems to be called Bodhiśarman, like a Brāhmaṇa, in a Nagarjunikonda inscription of the third century A.D.[35] We have also Vaiśya-type names of Brāhmaṇas as Bhavakoṭigupta, Śivadatta, Bhavaskandatrāta, etc., in Pallava inscriptions of the 5th and 6th centuries A.D.[36] In the fourth century A.D., the Kadamba kingdom was founded about the North Kanara District of Mysore by a Brāhmaṇa named Mayūraśarman whose successors, however, had all names ending with the word *varman.*

That the process of the creation of family names out of name-endings went on for a long time is also proved by other evidences at our disposal. The successors of Candragupta I (c. 319-35 A.D.), the founder of the Gupta empire, who was the son of Ghaṭotkaca and the grandson of Gupta, all assumed names ending in the word *gupta* and thereby led to the development of the name of the Gupta dynasty. In the same way, the successors of Gopāla I (c. 750-70 A.D.), who was the founder of an imperial house in Eastern India and was the son of Vapyaṭa and grandson of Dayitaviṣṇu, all assumed names ending in *pāla* and thereby gave rise to the name of the Pāla dynasty. In a number of East Indian epigraphic records of the Gupta and post-Gupta ages, including the Dubi and Nidhanpur plates[37] of Bhāskaravarman of Kāmarūpa, the Brāhmaṇa donees, belonging to particular *śākhās* and *gotras* and apparently to the same families, are found to have generally names ending in the same word such as *ghoṣa*, *soma*, *pālita*, *deva*, *kuṇḍa*, *nāga*, *bhūti*, *soma*, *mitra*, etc. These had thus become stereotyped as family names. What is interesting in such cases is that many of these Brāhmaṇical cognomens do not conform to the prescription of certain authorities regarding the family names of the different *varṇas* as indicated above, while no Brāhmaṇa family in the Bengal-Assam region is now known as Ghoṣa, Soma, Pālita, Kuṇḍa, etc., which are, well-known non-Brāhmaṇa cognomens. This latter fact may suggest that some of the old Brāhmaṇical families have merged into non-Brāhmaṇa communities in the area in question.[38] Deva is no doubt a Brāhmaṇical name-ending according to our old authorities ; but it is now a cognomen of the Kāyasthas in Bengal. *Nāga* may be a clan name, though it may also be the stereotyped name-ending of persons named after snake-deities like Ananta-nāga, Śeṣa-nāga, Kārkoṭa-nāga, etc.

---

[34] Sircar, *The Successors of the Sātavāhanas,* pp. 390-91 ; also *Select Inscriptions,* 1965, pp. 456 ff.

[35] *Sel. Ins.,* p. 234, text line 2.

[36] Sircar, *Suc. Sāt.,* pp. 197, 211.

[37] See P. N. Bhattacharya, *Kāmrūpaśāsanāvalī,* pp. 1 ff.; Sircar in *Ep. Ind.,* Vol. XXX, pp. 287 ff.

It will be seen from our discussion that the Pallavas, Kadambas and Guptas, who had stereotyped name-endings as their family names, ruled in the fourth and fifth centuries and, therefore, ealier than the Maitrakas whose earliest record is dated in the year 502 A.D.[39] Thus the stereotyping of name-endings into family names began considerably earlier than the advent of the Maitrakas and Hūṇas in India. Moreover, the clear cases of the formation of the cognomens of the Guptas and Pālas prove that, at least in these cases, *Gupta* and *Pāla* were certainly not tribal or clan names.

---

[38] Sircar, *Ind. Ep.*, pp. 423-24.

[39] See Sircar, *Select Inscriptions*, Vol. I, 1965 ed., pp. 426 ff.

The fact that *Varman* (*Varmā*), later regarded as a typical Kṣatriya family name, is a cognomen of the Nāgara-Brāhmaṇas only shows that, when the said surname developed among the Nāgara-Brāhmaṇas, the conception of Varman (Varmā) as a Kṣatriya cognomen had not become rigid. It should also be noted in this connection that the so-called Brāhmaṇa name-ending *śarmā* (*śarman*) is also a cognomen of the Bengal Kāyasthas who are not a Brāhmaṇa community.[40] Of course, it is possible to think that, Kāyastha (literally, 'a scribe') being a professional caste, the Kṣatriyas and Brāhmaṇas adopting the profession of scribes may have been merged into the community.

The family name Maitraka, by which the Valabhī kings are known, may be derived from Mitra or the Sun-god, and they may have been Sun-worshipping Iranians settled in India.[41] But the names of most of the Maitraka kings end in *sena* (the secondary names of some of them ending in *bhaṭa*), and none of them ends in the word *mitra*.

We are thus unable to agree fully with Bhandarkar when he says, "the present Nāgara Brāhmaṇa caste is a curious combination of Brāhmaṇic and non-Brāhmaṇic elements. Two of their *śarmans* (family names), viz. Śarmā (Śarman) and Deva are, as laid down by the Smṛtis, name-suffixes of the Brāhmaṇas ; one, viz., Varmā (Varman), is that of the Kṣatriyas ; two others, viz., Datta and Gupta, are those of the Vaiśyas ; and one, viz. Dāsa, of the Śūdras. All these elements, it may therefore be argued, combined to form the Nāgara caste. But the correct view appears to me to be to take all these *śarmans* (family names) as the names of tribes or clans that were amalgamated into the Nāgara caste."[42]

---

[40] See Bhandarkar quoted above, and also *Śabdakalpadruma*, s.v. *Kāyastha*, quoting both the Dakṣiṇa-Rāḍhīya and Vārendra *Kulapañjī* works.

[41] Cf. Sircar, *The Guhilas of Kiṣkindhā*, p. 6.

It may be admitted that the Nāgara-Brāhmaṇas and Bengal Kāyasthas are both mixed communities having the blood of different *varṇas* ; but the family names discussed above are mostly quite clearly stereotyped name-endings as indicated by the cases of the Guptas and Pālas and can hardly be the names of different tribes or clans. Most of the above family names can be easily explained as developed out of name-endings, e. g. Ghoṣa from Mañjughoṣa (one having a pleasant voice), Vajraghoṣa (one having a thundering voice), etc. ; Mitra from Devamitra (a friend of the gods), Rāmamitra (a friend of the god Rāma), etc. ; Datta from Haridatta (given by or dedicated to the god Hari), Durgādatta (given by or dedicated to the goddess Durgā), etc. ; Dāsa from Rudradāsa (a servant of the god Rudra), Ambādāsa (a servant of one's mother or of the Mother-goddess), etc. ; Sena from Mahāsena (bearing the name of the god Kārttikeya), Devasena (one whose forces are the gods), etc. ; Vasu from Amitavasu (one having great wealth), Dharmavasu (one whose wealth is his virtue), etc. ; Kuṇḍa from Bhaktikuṇḍa (one who is the receptacle of devotion), Premakuṇḍa (one who is the receptacle of love), etc. ; Pālita from Bandhupālita (one reared or protected by his friends), Devapālita (one reared or protected by the gods), etc. ; Soma from Ravisoma (bearing the name of the solar and lunar deities), Bhānusoma (bearing the name of the solar and lunar gods), etc. ; Guha from Gaṇeśaguha (bearing the names of the gods Gaṇeśa and Kārttikeya), Vināyakaguha (bearing the names of the gods Gaṇeśa and Kārttikeya), etc. ; Deva from Indradeva (bearing the name of the god Indra), Agnideva (bearing the name of the fire-god), etc., etc. Moreover it is a significant fact that these family names can scarcely be traced in the lists of peoples in the epics and Purāṇas and later works like the *Bṛhatsaṁhitā*. If Bhandarkar's theory that family names were essentially the names of clans would have had any substance, at least a number of the said family names would have been often mentioned as tribal names in the works of Sanskrit and Pali-Prakrit literature and also of the regional Indian languages. This is certainly not the case.

---

[42] *Op. cit.,* p. 63.

III

FRESH LIGHT ON THE HISTORY OF RAJASTHAN

Recent study of a number of inscriptions from the Rajasthan area has thrown considerable light on the early and medieval history of Rajasthan. We are inclined to discuss the evidence of some of these records in the present section.

An inscription of considerable importance was discovered in the Bhramaramātā temple at Choṭī-Sāddī in the old Mevāḍ State, which is situated near the Neemuch station on the Ajmer-Khandwa railway line.[1] The record was noticed by Gaurishankar Hirachand Ojha in his *Rājpūtānekā Itihās* (Hindī), Vol. II, 1932, pp. 1442 ff., though this notice is full of mistakes while the text of the epigraph quoted by him contains, besides errors, a large number of lacunae.

The date of the Choṭī-Sāddī inscription, as given in the last stanza, is the tenth *tithi* of the bright half of the month of Māgha in the year 547 apparently of the Vikrama era, the day falling in January 491 A.D. On that date, a king named Gauri built a temple of the Mother-goddess. He was a Kṣatriya of the Mānavāyani clan and was the son of Yaśogupta, grandson of Rāṣṭra (Rāṣṭravardhana), great-grandson of Rājyavardhana and great-great-grandson of Puṇyasoma of the Mānavāyani family. The poet, who composed the *praśasti*, had a very poor knowledge of the Sanskrit language. His name was Bhramarasoma, who was the son of Mitrasoma and the grandson of Jīvadharaṇa. The last sentence of the inscription says that the *pūrvā* was written (*likhitā*) by Aparājita who meditated on, or was favoured by the feet of Prince (*Rājaputra*) Gobhaṭa who may have been the son of king Gauri. The word *pūrvā* means 'the above-cited' with reference to *tithi* (date) or *praśasti* (eulogy). The word *likhitā* seems to suggest that Aparājita wrote down the eulogy on the piece of stone, with some material, for facilitating the work of engraving. This Aparājita was apparently a royal officer serving under Prince Gobhaṭa.

---

[1] *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXX, pp. 120 ff.

The importance of the Choṭī-Sāḍḍī inscription lies in the fact that it reveals the existence of a new line of rulers who flourished about the second half of the 5th century in the area about the borders of Rajasthan and Malwa.

Another inscription[2] of *Mahārāja* Gauri has been found at Mandasor (now spelt Mandsaur, headquarters of a District of that name in Madhya Pradesh) and shows that he owed allegiance to the Aulikara king Ādityavardhana of Daśapura (i.e. Mandasor). This epigraph records the construction of a tank in the suburbs of Daśapura by Gauri for the merit of his deceased mother. Since the excavation of a tank at the place where the funeral pile of a dead person stood is a well-known custom, it is possible to think that Gauri's mother died at the capital of his overlord. She may have been a princess of the Aulikara family.

That the Aulikara king Yaśodharman Viṣṇuvardhana, whose only known date is 532 A.D.,[3] ruled over considerable parts of Mevāḍ is indicated by several records. A fragmentary stone inscription[4] from Citoḍgaḍ, which seems to have been brought from Nagarī in the same neighbourhood, has been attributed to the reign of Yaśodharman. An interesting fact about this epigraph is that it refers to a *Rājasthānīya* or viceroy ruling over the territory around Daśapura and Madhyamā or Madhyamikā, i.e. Nagarī near Citoḍgaḍ. Thus Nagarī (Madhyamikā-nagarī) seems to have been the headquarters of a district of the Aulikara kingdom during Yaśodharman's reign in the first half of the sixth century A.D. It has also to be noted that a Mandasor inscription[5] of 532 A.D. mentions Yaśodharman's *Rājasthānīya* Abhayadatta who was ruling over an area containing many districts under his officers and lying between the Vindhya and Pāriyātra and extending as far as the Sindhu or the Arabian Sea. Since the Aravalli range forming a part of the old Pāriyātra lies to the west of Mevāḍ, the above description of the western province of Yaśodharman's kingdom shows that much of Mevāḍ was in the possession of the Aulikaras at least during the said king's reign.

---

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 127 ff.

[3] Sircar, *Select Inscriptions*, Vol. I, 1965 ed., pp. 411 ff.

[4] *Ibid.*, Vol. XXXIV, pp. 53 ff.

The Kanaswa (old Kotah State) inscription of 738 A. D. mentions a Maurya king named Dhavalātman (Dhavalappa) while the Dabok (old Udaipur State) inscription, now assigned to 644 A.D., speaks of Dhavalappa (Dhavalātman) enjoying the imperial titles *Paramabhaṭṭāraka*, *Mahārājādhirāja* and *Parameśvara.*[6] A fragmentary inscription[7] from Mathurā has now revealed the names of the following Maurya kings of apparently the same house—(1) Kṛṣṇarāja belonging to the Maurya dynasty ; (2) in his family, Candragupta ; (3) his son Āryarāja, and (4) the latter's son Ḍiṇḍirāja *alias* Karka who burnt the city of Kānyakubja (Kanauj in the Farrukhabad District, U.P.). The inscription has been assigned to the latter half of the seventh century A.D. when the Maurya king Ḍiṇḍirāja Karka appears to have flourished.

The date of the Dabok inscription of Guhila Dhanika, who was a feudatory of the imperial Maurya ruler Dhavalappa, was variously read and interpreted by the earlier writers on the subject ; but it has now been shown that the date has to be read as year 701 which should be referred to the Vikrama era. If, thus, the date of the Dabok inscription is Vikrama 701, i.e. 644 A.D.,[8] we have to believe that Harṣavardhana (606-47 A.D.) of Kanauj, to whom the Guhilas appear to have originally owed allegiance, lost his hold on Rajasthan sometime before his death. This reminds us of the fact that Maitraka Dhruvasena II was Harṣa's son-in-law and vassal or subordinate ally, though the former's son Dharasena IV assumed imperial style by the Gupta-Valabhī year 326 (644-45 A.D.),[9] i.e. a few years before the death of Harṣa.

---

[5] *Sel. Ins.*, *op. cit.*, pp. 415-16, verse 19.

[6] See Sircar, *The Guhilas of Kiṣkindhā*, p. 51 ; Bhandarkar's List of Inscriptions, No. 18 ; *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XX, pp. 122 ff.

[7] *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXXII, pp. 207 ff.

The Jain tradition representing king Yaśovarman (c. 725-53 A.D.) of Kanauj as a descendant of Candragupta Maurya[10] is generally regarded by the historians as doubtful ; but the burning of the city of Kanauj by a Maurya ruler in the latter half of the seventh century A.D., as now revealed by the Mathura inscription, seems to suggest that after all the Jain tradition may be correct and may really refer to Yaśovarman's relations with Karka Ḍiṇḍirāja who was the grandson of a Maurya king named Candragupta[11] and through him with the ancient Maurya dynasty of Pāṭaliputra which was founded by the great Candragupta in the fourth century B.C.

Some recently discovered epigraphs have revealed the names of the following six rulers of the Kiṣkindhā branch of the Guhila dynasty[12] of Mevāḍ—

1) *Mahārāja* Paḍḍa (about the first quarter of the

---

[8] *Ibid.*, Vol. XXXV, pp. 100 ff.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 101 ; Bhandarkar's List, Nos. 1348-49.

[10] Tripathi, *History of Kanauj*, p. 194.

[11] *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXXIV, pp. 166 ff.

[12] Sircar, *The Guhilas of Kiṣkindhā*, p. 58.

seventh century A.D.) known from the Kalyāṇpur stone inscription of his time.

2) *Avāptāśeṣamahāśabda* Devagaṇa (second quarter of the seventh century A.D.) known from the two Ḍuṅgarpur copper-plate grants—one issued by Bhāvihita in 653 A.D. and the other by Bābhaṭa in 689 A.D.

(3) *Samadhigatapañcamahāśabda* Bhāvihita (third quarter of the seventh century A. D.) known from his Ḍuṅgarpur copper-plate grant issued from Kiṣkindhipura in 653 A.D.

(4) *Mahārāja* Bhetti (eighth decade of the seventh century A.D.) known from his Dhulev or Ṛṣabhdev copper-plate grant issued from Kiṣkindhā in 679 A.D.

(5) *Samupārjitapañcamahāśabda* Bābhaṭa (ninth decade of the seventh century A.D.) known from his Ḍuṅgarpur copper-plate charter issued from Kiṣkindhipura in 689 A.D.

(6) Kadachi (sometime in the eighth century A.D.) known from the Kalyāṇpur stone inscription of his time.[13]

Of two recently published inscriptions[14] of the Pushkar-Ajmer region, the first records certain gifts made by Malhaṇa in favour of the god Puṇḍarīkākṣa (Viṣṇu) of Puṣkara and their ratification by the local ruler Durgarāja in Vikrama 994 (938 A.D.). The second inscription records the gifts of Durgarāja and others made in favour of the god Rannāditya (Sūrya, husband of the goddess Rannā = Rājñī) about Vikrama 1013 (956 A.D.). The most interesting information supplied by the second epigraph is that Durgarāja was a *Mahantaka* under *Mahārājādhirāja* Siṁharāja who was no doubt the Cāhamāna king of the same name. The extension of Cāhamāna power in the Puskhar-Ajmer region about the middle of the tenth century A.D. is an interesting addition to our knowledge. The epithet *Mahantaka* applied to Durgarāja seems to be the same as *Mahattaka*, *Mahattara* or *Mahattama* which was the designation of the leaders of the village and district councils of administration.

---

[13] See *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXX, pp. ff., 5 ff.; Vol. XXXIV, pp. 167 ff.; Vol. XXXV, pp. 55 ff.

[14] *Ibid.*, Vol. XXXV, pp. 239 ff.

An inscription, written mainly in the Rājasthānī language and Nāgarī script, is incised on a stone embedded in a step-well called Gaṇeś-bāwḍī at Toḍā Rāising in the Jaipur District of Rajasthan, about 16 miles to the north of Deolī and 20 miles to the south-west of Tonk. Daya Ram Sahni, who noticed the epigraph in his *Archaeological Remains and Excavations at Sambhar*, failed to realise the importance of the record.

The date of the inscription, quoted in lines 4-5, is the second *tithi* of the dark-half of Mārgaśīrṣa in Vikrama 1604 and Śaka 1469, i.e. in 1547 A.D. The name of the week-day is given as *Vārhanīpati* which apparently stands for *Bṛhaspati* (Thursday). The date is irregular, but must have fallen in October-November, 1547 A.D.[15]

At the beginning of the inscription is a passage in Sanskrit invoking the grace of the god Gaṇeśa which is followed by a stanza containing an adoration to the god Vighnavināśana (Gaṇeśa), praised as the Supreme Being. The above is followed by the date already discussed above. Next come the names of the following persons *Pro* (*Prohita = Purohita*) Kānhaḍa (Sanskrit *Kṛṣṇa*), his son *Pro* Nārāyaṇa, his two sons *Pro* Maheśa and *Pro* Cakrapāṇi, and the latter's sons *Ci* (*Cirañjīva*) Kāśīdāsa and *Ci* Kimudāsa. *Pro* means 'a priest' and *Ci* means 'long-lived'. The inscription does not clearly state the relation of Kāśīdāsa and Kimudāsa with the construction of the step-well which is its object, though there is little doubt that the two brothers were responsible for the excavation of the step-well or at least its supervision.

---

[15] The *Annual Report on Indian Epigraphy*, 1952-53, No. B-413 (p. 69) gives the regular equivalent of the date of the inscription as the 9th December 1546 A.D. This is possible, however, only if the month is regarded as *amānta* and the years are taken to be current.

The following passage quotes the genealogy of *Rāo Rājā* Rāmacandra in whose jurisdiction the *bāwḍī* was excavated. He was the son of *Rājā* Pṛthvīrāja and the grandson of *Rājādhirāja Rājā* Sūryaseni (possibly *Sūryasena*). This section also mentions *Kuṁwara* (*Kumāra*) *Ca* (*Ci* = *Cirañjīva*) Parasarāma (Parśurāma) who seems to have held the area around the step-well as his *jāgīr*. These rulers of the Toḍā Rāisingh region are not known from any other inscription. The reason for applying a more dignified title to one of them is not clear.

Next is introduced the *vāra* or reign-period of *Pātisāha* (*Pādshā* or *Bādshā*) Asalema Sāhī (Islām Shāh, 1445-54 A.D.), the son of Sera Sāhī Sūra, i.e. Sher Shāh (1439-45 A.D.) of the Sūr dynasty. Then follows the mention of *Rāṇā* Udaiyasiṁghadeva (Udayasiṁhadeva), son of *Rājā* Saṁgrāmadeva, as ruling over the Kumbhalamera-rājya.

It is interesting to note that the independent or imperial status of *Rājā* Saṅgrāma is especially indicated in the inscription which describes him as *sarva-bhūmikau khasama* (the lord of the entire earth), which is a conventional designation of Indian Imperial rulers, and as *ghoḍā lākha 11 kau khasama* (the lord of eleven lakhs of horses or horsemen). The mention of Udayasiṁha, the ruler of Kumbhalamera, after that of the emperor (*Pātisāha*) Islām Shāh undoubtedly points to the fact that the *Rāṇā* was regarded as a feudatory of the Muhammadan monarch, even though his father Saṁgrāmadeva (i.e. Saṅgrāmasiṁha or

Sāṅgā) was an independent king. Udayasiṁha's association with Kumbhalamera and not with Citrakūṭa or Citoḍ seems to suggest that Citoḍ was not his capital at the time when the Toḍā Rāising inscription was drafted.

The style of mentioning *Rāo Rājā* Rāmacandra, his immediate liegelord *Rāṇā* Udayasiṁha, and the latter's overlord *Pātisāha* Islām Shāh without clearly specifying the relations of one with the others in words is well known from a number of late medieval documents from Rajasthan. Thus an inscription[16] from Rāmpurā near Mandasor, dated Śaka 1547, introduces the Mughul emperor Salema Shāha (Salīm Shāh=Jahāngīr), his feudatory *Rāṇā* Karṇasiṁha of Mevāḍ and the latter's subordinate at Rāmpurā as follows—

Dīlī-rāja Pātisāha śrī-Salema Sāhajī (|*) *Citrakūṭarāja vāsa Udepu*[*ra*] *Rāṇā śrī-Amarasīghajī* (|*) *tasya putra Rāṇā śrī-Karaṇasīghajī* (|*) *Rāmapura-rājakara Rāva śrī-Candrabhānajī* (|*) *tasyā Rāṇī Cohāna Prabhāvatībāījī bāvaḍī prāsāda bāga udhāsyo* (|*)

Translation—"The illustrious emperor (*Pātisāha*=*Bādshā*) Salīm Shāh, is the ruler of Dīlī. The illustrious *Rāṇā* Amarasiṁha is the ruler of Citrakūṭa ; but he resides at Udayapura. His son is the illustrious *Rāṇā* Karṇasiṁha. The illustrious *Rāo* Candrabhānu is [the ruler] of the Rāmpura State. His Cauhān queen is Prabhāvatībāījī who made the step-well, the palace and the garden."

Two other inscriptions[17] from Sitamau near Mandasor have similar passages. The first of them is dated Vikrama 1761 (1705 A.D.) and contains the passage—*Pātasāha-śrī Oraṁgajebaḥ Rāṇā-Amarasīghaḥ Jāgī*[*r*]*dāraḥ Rāṭhoḍa-Kesodāsa* i.e. the Rāṭhoḍ Jāgīrdār Keśavadāsa under *Rāṇā* Amarasiṁha owing allegiance to the Mughul emperor Aurangzeb. The other inscription, dated Vikrama 1775 (1718 A.D.) has—*Pātasāha śrī-Sapharakasenajī Amarasīghajī Mahājrājajīḥ Kesodāsajī*. This record mentions the same Keśavadāsa styled *Mahārāja* as a subordinate of *Rāṇā* Amarasiṁha who was a feudatory of the *Pātisāha*. *Sapharakasena* is the corrupt form of the name of emperor Farrukhsiyar (1713-19 A.D.). It should also be noted that *Rāṇā* Amarasiṁha II of Udayapura was dead before the date of the inscription and was succeeded by Saṅgrāmasiṁha II.

---

[16] *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXX, pp. 192-93.

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 193, note 1.

The latter part of the Toḍā-Rāising inscription mentions the names of four of the artisans or masons who were employed in the construction of the step-well. The writer of the epigraph was *Jo* (*Joṣī* = *Jyotiṣin*) Rāmadāsa, and the expenditure for the excavation was *taṁ* (*taṅka*) 1001 probably meaning the silver rupees of Sher Shāh. The equivalent of the above amount is also given in the Mevāḍ currency, though it is difficult to understand the correct amount mentioned in this connection.

The importance of the Toḍā-Rāising inscription lies in the fact that *Rāṇā* Udayasiṁha (1537-72 A.D.) of Mevāḍ is represented in it as a feudatory of the Sūr emperor Islām Shāh (1545-54) A.D.), son of Sher Shāh (1539-45 A.D.). We know that, in Vikrama 1594 (1537 A.D.) Udayasiṁha was recognised as the *Rāṇā* of Mevāḍ by the feudatories at Kumbhalgaḍh and also that he recovered Citoḍ from Vanavīra about three years later in Vikrama 1597 (1540 A.D.).[18] He was a contemporary of all the rulers of the Sūr dynasty (1539-56 A.D.) founded by Sher Shāh, though very little was so far known about the *Rāṇā*'s relations with the Sūrs. According to the Muslim chroniclers, Sher Shāh occupied Citoḍ in 1543 or 1544 A.D., although they are silent as to whether the *Rāṇā* offered his allegiance to the Sūr emperor or continued to hold sway over parts of Mevāḍ outside the Citoḍ region as an independent ruler. Tod does not mention the Sūr occupation of Citoḍ ; but Wolsely Haig says in his discussion on Sher Shāh's campaigns in Rajasthan, "He (Sher Shāh) left Khavass Khān and 'Isā Khān Niyāzī to establish his authority in Marwar and marched to Chitor, the keys of which were sent to him by the officer who held it on behalf of *Rāṇā* Uday Singh of Mewar."[19] Qanungo says, "He (Sher Shāh) spent a few months at Agra and rejoined his camp at Ajmer about the middle of June, 1544. From Ajmer he marched towards Chitor which he easily acquired. ... ... Mewar had not yet recovered from the evil effects of the civil dissensions which ended with the installation of the boy king Udai Singh in 1542 A.D. (see Tod's *Rajasthan*, pp. 330-35), Chitor was placed in charge of Shamas Khān, a brother of Khawas Khan (Dorn's *History of the Afghans*, p. 140), Miān Ahmed Sarwānī and Hussain Khān Khaljī (Abbas, p. 235)."[20] Ojha quotes Abbas Sarwānī's *Tārīkh-i-Sher Shāhī*, according to which Sher Shāh advanced against Citoḍ in A.H. 950 (1543 A.D.) after having dispersed the forces of Māladeva of Marwar : "Sher Shāh ... marched towards the fort of Citoḍ. When he was yet 12 *kos* from the fort of Citoḍ, the *Rājā* who was its ruler sent him the keys. When Sher Shāh came to Citoḍ, he left there the younger brother of Khawas Khān, Miān Ahmed Sarwānī and Hussain Khān Khaljī. Sher Shāh himself marched towards Kachwara."[21] But the author of the *Udaypur-*

---

[18] Ojha, *Udaypur-rājyakā Itihās* (*Rājpūtānekā Itihās*, Vol. II), pp. 714 ff.

---

[19] *Camb. His. Ind.*, Vol. IV, p. 55.

[20] *Sher Shah*, 1st ed., pp. 332-33.

[21] Cf. Elliot and Dowson, *History of India as told by its own Historians*, Vol. IV, p. 406.

rājyakā Itihās further observes in this connection, "It was almost the beginning of Udayasiṁha's reign. Thus it is possible that Udayasiṁha considered it unwise to fight with Sher Shāh and managed to send him away after making peace with him. Neither the Persian nor the local chronicles explain, as is expected in such a case, how Citoḍ came back into Udayasiṁha's possession [after the Sūr occupation]."[22]

As we have seen, very little has so far been said about Udayasiṁha's relations with Sher Shāh and his successors. But the Toḍā Rāisingh inscription suggests that *Rāṇā* Udayasiṁha not only acknowledged the suzerainty of Sher Shāh, but continued his allegiance to the Sūr dynasty down to the early years of Islām Shāh's reign. There is no reason to believe that Islām Shāh, represented as the overlord of the *Rāṇā* in October-November, 1547 A.D., himself subdued Udayasiṁha. The mention of Udayasiṁha as the ruler of Kumbhalameru suggests, as we have seen, that he was staying at the fort of Kumbhalgaḍh till the end of 1547 A.D. while Citoḍ continued to be in the possession of the Afghan governors employed by the Sūr emperors. The presence of a strong Afghan garrison at Citoḍ must have prevented the *Rāṇā* from throwing off the Sūr yoke.[23]

The date of Udyasiṁha's freedom from the Sūr yoke cannot be definitely determined. After the Afghan general Khawas Khān had taken refuge in the hills of Kumāun

---

[22] *Op. cit.*, p. 718.

[23] It has been observed (*IHQ*, Vol. XXX, pp. 311 ff.; *Journ. Bomb. Univ.*, July, 1955, pp. 10-11) that the *Amarakāvya* represents Udayasiṁha as an idependent monarch, while the *Vaṁśāvalī* (No. 872) states that Udayasiṁha defeated the Pathans. We do not attach any importance to such vague evidence and claims; cf. the representation of Udayasiṁha as having humbled the Mughul emperor (*Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXIV, p. 68, verse 30), although it is well known that Akbar defeated him and occupied a considerable part of Mevāḍ including Citoḍ.

Islām Shāh is said to have declared that he forgave all the former's offences and requested him to proceed against the *Rāṇā* of Udayapura who had again raised his head, plundered several of the royal possessions and carried off the wives and daughters of Muslims, although at the same time the governor of Sambhal was ordered to put the general to death as soon as he would come within reach.[24] This event took place in A.H. 959 (1551 A.D.) according to some authorities.[25] *Rāṇā* Udayasiṁha thus seems to have thrown off his allegiance to the Sūrs before the date of Khawas Khān's murder.[26] The reference to Sūr territory which was plundered by the *Rāṇā* and from which Muslim women were carried away, seems to point to the reoccupation of the Citoḍ region by Udayasiṁha.

Another interesting fact known from the Toḍā Rāising inscription is the inclusion of at least parts of the Jaipur District within the dominions of the *Rāṇās* of Mevāḍ. Cunninghum sketched the history of the place on the basis of Rājpūt traditions which have nothing to say on this point. This shows how untrustworthy those traditions are as a source of history. There is no mention of the chief Rāmacandra and his father and grandfather in Cunningham's account, though the *Amarakāvya* is said to state that Toḍā was given to Rāmacandra by *Rāṇā* Udayasiṁha.[27]

---

[24] *Camb. Hist Ind.*, op. cit., p. 59; Elliot and Dowson, *op. cit.*, p. 531; N. B. Roy, *Successors of Sher Shāh*, p. 33.

[25] Badāūnī's *Muntakhab-ut-Tawārīkh*, trans. Ranking, Vol. I, pp. 525-26.

[26] The date is sometimes given as 1546 A.D. (*Camb. Hist. Ind.*, *op. cit.*, p. 59) and 1550 A.D.=A. H. 957 (Elliot and Dowson, *op. cit.*, p. 532, note 1). Since the *Rāṇā's* insurrection must have been a widely known fact, the first of the dates is impossible. The Toḍā Rāising inscription shows that the *Rāṇā* did not throw off the Sūr yoke before the close of 1547 A.D.

[27] Cf. note 23 above.

INDEX

Abbas Sarwani 104
Abhayadatta 97
Ābhīra people 39, 40
Abyssinia 50
Ācārya 12; Sarvajñaśānti 12
Achaemenian—dynasty 21 ; empire 32
Ādiśūra 80n
Afghan—general 104 ; governor 105
Afghanistan 1-2, 20, 23, 25-26, 28, 30, 32-33, 38, 41-42, 44, 46, 48, 51
Afrasiyab 3
Africa 50
Agni Purāṇa 72n
Agnideva 93
Agra 104
Ahicchatra 57, 74-75, 77, 80-81, 91
Ahicchatrapura 78
Ahura Mazda 11
Aibak, Quṭb-uddīn 54
Aikṣvāku dynasty 71
Ajmer 85, 95, 99-100, 104 ; inscription 78n
Akbar 18, 105n
Akola 57
Al-Birūnī 12
Aligarh 70n
Allahabad 4; District 55
Allahabad pillar inscription 35n
Allan, J. 62n
Allaṭa 86
Altekar, A. S. 58n, 59n
Alexander 21, 24, 32, 71
Amarakāvya 105n, 106
Amarasīgha (Amarasiṁha) 102-03
Amarasiṁha II 103
Amarāvatī 57
Ambādās, Ambādāsa 88, 93
Ambala-Karnal region 38
Amitavasu 93
Aṇahilā 76-77
Ananta 78
Ananta-nāga 91
Andhra Pradesh 79
Aṅga—country 30-31, 77; people 37
Aṅgulimāla 30
Anio 15
Aṅkottaka (Aṅkottaka-caturaśīti) 79
An-si (Parthia) 43
An-shi-kao 5
Antarvedi territory 80
Anūpa country 72
Arabian sea 97
Arachosia, same as Kandahar 33
Araikhsho 15
Aramaic 22
Āraṭṭa, same as Vāhīka 36-37
Aravalli range 97
Ardashīr I 47 and n
Ardashīr Babagan, same as Ardashīr I 17
Ardokhsho 15, 17
Areia (Herat) 46
Aria, same as Areia (Herat) 33
Arindama 80n
Arjuna 40, 79, 71-72
Arrian 32
Arthaśāstra 35
Āruṇi 29
Ārya 33, 36
Āryarāja 97
Ārya-Viśākhamitra 66

Asalema Sāhī 101
Asia 2-3, 21-23, 41, 47n 50
Aśmaka people 71
Aśoka 12, 19, 22, 33
Aśokacalla, Aśokavalla 79
Assyrian 32
Astacenian 32
Aśvaghoṣa 55-56
Ātash 11
Athsho 11, 15
Atharvaveda 30-31
Atilā(jā)ṅgala 79
Augustus 9
Aulikara dynasty 83, 96-97
Aurangzeb 103
Aureus 53
Aurva 73
Āvalladevī 86
Avanti 48n, 71n, 158
Āvantya 72n
Ayodhyā 55
Azes 24; I 21; II 22
Azilises 21
Bābhaṭa 99
Babylon 33
Bactria 21, 47n
Bactrian 20, 46; kingdom 21; Greeks, same as Yavana 33
Bactriane 46
Badami 70 and n
Badakhshan 20, 41, 43, 50n
Badāun in U.P. 75
Badāunī 106n
Boddo 11
Bagalkot Taluka 74
Bagchi, P. C. 70n
Baglan 11, 23
Bago 12
Bahawalpur 55
Bahraich District 55
Bahram 11
Bāhu 73
Bālāditya 49, 84
Balasore 61
Balavarman 85
Bālhīka 30
Balkh 47
Baluchistan 47
Bāṇa 85
Bandhula 30
Bandhupālita 93
Banerjea, J. N. 10, 15-16
Banerji, R. D. 60n
Barabhum 62
Bardesanes 45
Bareily 39, 81; District 75
Baripada 60n
Bārhadratha dynasty 71 and n
Basak, R. G. 35n
Basarh in Muzaffarpur Dist. 59
Bastar 77
Bauddha 14
Baudhāyana 30
Beas 75
Beal, 42n, 44n
Beglar 60n, 61
Belvadag in Ranchi Dist. 58
Bengal 43, 57-59, 65-66, 67 and n, 80, 87, 88 and n, 93
Bengal Kāyastha community 88, 92-93
Bhagalpur 58
Bhāgavata Purāṇa 72n
Bhairanmatti (Bagalkot Taluka, Bijapur Dist.) inscription 74
Bhāratavarṣa 22
Bharatpur 39
Bhaktikuṇḍa 93
Bhandarkar, D. R. 40n, 69-70, 73, 74 and n, 75n, 76 and n, 77n, 80-82, 85n, 86n, 87 and n, 88-89, 92 and n, 94, 97. 98n
Bhandarkar, R. G. 3, 40n
Bhanjakia 60 and n
Bhāradvāja-gotra 90
Bhāratīya Vidyā Bhavan 3
Bharatpur 80
Bhāskaravarman 91
Bhaṭa 92

Bhattacharya, P. N. 90n
Bhava 87
Bhavakoṭigupta 90
Bhavaskandatrāta 90
Bhavnagar 87
Bhitari pillar inscription 48n, 83
Bhogāvatī 74
Bhogāvatīpura-parameśvara 74
Bhoja 71
Bhopal State 55
Bhramaramātā temple 95
Bhramarasoma 95
Bhūridatta Jātaka 33n
Bhūṣaṇa 76
Bhūta 87-88
Bhūti 89, 91
Bidar District 69
Bihar 13, 30, 55-63, 65
Biharsharif 13
Bijholi inscription 77
Bijapur District 74
Bistam, Sassanian king 49
Bizago 15
Bloomfield 31
Bodhgaya 58 and n
Bodhiśarman 90
Bodhisattva 14, 66-67
Bogra in East Pakistan 58
Bolor 27
Brāhmaṇa 12, 16, 25, 29, 31, 33, 39, 64n, 72, 75, 78, 80-81, 87, 88 and n, 89 and n, 90-92
Brahmarṣi-deśa 39
Brāhmī alphabet 23, 26, 47
Bṛhatsaṁhitā 94
Buddha 9-11, 14-15, 18, 29, 32,
Buddhism 5, 11-12, 14, 17, 24-25, 27, 35, 142
Buddhist 5, 7, 11-14, 17, 25-27, 32, 71; Council 15; establishment 17; literature 29, 31; monasteries 7, 14, 26; records 7; tradition 5, 12, 15
Bukhara 19, 52
Bulychov, K. 51n
Buner 32
Buxar (Shahabad Dist.) 59
Cāhamāna 77, 79; clan 75, 78; king 100; kingdom 98
Caitya 12, 14
Cakrapāṇi 100
Calcutta 3, 7, 40n, 69n, 74n, 86n; University 3
Cālukya dynasty 70, 77, 85-86
Caltis 64
Cambyses 32
Campāvatī 4n
Candana (Candra) Kaṇiṣka 56n
Caṇḍavīra 10n
Cand Bardāi 86
Candrabhāgā 35
Candrabhāna, Candrabhānu 102
Candragomin 84 and n
Candragupta I 90
Candragupta II 4
Candragupta Maurya 32, 87-98
Catholic 17
Cauhān 102
Cedi 37
Central Asia 1-3, 21-22, 41
Chanda, R. P. 58n
Chandraketugarh 66
Chamba State 75
Chang-K'ien 19, 41
Charsadda 32
Chatterjee, B. 47n, 59n
Chavannes, M. 41, 50n
Chen-t'an Kia-ni-ch'a (Candana or Candra Kaṇiṣka) 56n
Chien-Han-shu 42
Chikkora family 77
China 19, 22, 41-44
Chinese 5, 7, 18-19, 22, 26, 41, 45, 48, 81, 84; *Tripiṭaka* 6; Turkestan 19
Chinda (Chindaka) family 75-77
Chinnock 32
Chitral 20, 42, 52
Chitor 104

Choṭī-Sāḍḍī inscription 95-96
Chouang-mi 20
Cīnabhukti 44n
Cirañjīva 101
Citoḍ 102-04, 105 and n, 106
Citoḍgaḍh 82, 96-97
Citrakūṭa 102
coins 9-10, 15-16, 23, 50, 53, 61-62; gold 62; copper 9, 57n, 59, 61-62, 65; bronze 51 and n, 53
Cophen 32n
Corinthian 24
Cosmas Indicopleustes 84
Cowell 5, 85n
Ctesiphon 48n
Culukeśvara (Cālukya) dynasty 76-77
Cunningham, 16, 55n, 58 and n, 60n, 61n, 106
Cyavana 76
Cyrus 32
Dabok in Udaipur 97-98
Dabra Dammo in Abyssinia 50
Dakṣiṇa-Rāḍhīya 92n
Dākṣiṇātya people 74n
Dalverzin-tepe 51n
Darbhanga 59 and n
Darius I 32
Darius III 32
Dāsa 33, 87-89, 92-93
Daśapura (Mandasor) 96
Datta 87, 89, 92-93
Dattātreya 72
Dayitaviṣṇu 90
Deccan 3
Delhi 3, 50n
Demetrios 24
Deolī 100
Deva 87-88, 89 and n, 91-93
Devagaṇa 99
Devamitra 93
Devapāla 13, 85
Devapālita 93
Devaputra 22, 54
Devarakṣita 77
Devasena 93
Dewal (Pilibhit Dist.) 76
Dhanbad 62
Dhanika, Guhila chief 97
Dhanyaviṣṇu 84
Dharaṇendra 74
Dharasena IV 98
Dhārāvarṣa-Jagadekabhūṣaṇa 77
Dharmadamadhara 61
Dharmapāla 30
Dharmāraṇya-vihāra 14
Dharmasūtra of Gautama 34
Dharmavasu 93
Dhavalappa (Dhavalātman) 97-98
Dhavalātman (Dhavalappa) 97
Dhruvasena II 98
Diddā, queen 30
Digambara 26
Dīlī (Delhi) 102
Dinajpur (East Pakistan) 66-67
Ḍiṇḍirāja *alias* Karka 97
Diodotus I 21
Dionysopolis (the city of Dionysus) 81
Dionysus 81
Doonsoo Pargana 14
Dorn 104
Dowson 104n, 106n
Drangiana 21
Drāviḍa 85n
Dravidian people 75
Dṛṣadvatī 39
Dubi plates 90
Dungarpur copper plates 99
Durgā 93
Durgādatta 93
Durgarāja 99-100
Durlabha 86
Durlabhadevī 86
Dushanbe 2-3
Dvārakā 40
East Pakistan 58, 66, 85
Eastern Cālukya dynasty 70n

Eastern India 50, 55, 56 and n, 58, 60, 62-63, 85, 90
Eastern Iran 21
Eastern Malwa 55
Eliot 5
Elliot 104n, 106n
Eran 84
Ermaiou 9
Eucratides 21, 24
Fa-hien 81
Faizabad District 55
Fan-ye 20, 41
Farr 11, 15
Farrukhabad District 39, 97
Ferghana 41
Fick 31
Fīrūz I 48
Fo-ho-lo (Baktra) 42n
Fu-nan 63
Gaṇapatināga 4
Gandhāra 6-7, 13, 24-27, 29, 32, 34, 36, 44 and n, 49, 67; country 29; School 24, 50, 67; style 56
Gandhāri 30-31
Gaṇeśa 15, 93, 100
Gaṇeśaguhā 93
Gaṇeś-bāwḍī 100
Gaṅga inscriptions 82
Gangaridai 65
Gaṅgavāḍi 79
Ganges—river 63-64, 75; country 64; valley 65
Ganjam District 61
Gauḍa—country 30n; people 74n
Gauri, king 95-96
Gautama 11
Gawalior inscription 84
Gaya 58, 76-77, 79
Gedrosia, same as Baluchistan 33
Ghaṭotkaca 90
Ghirshman 16
Ghoṣa 87-88, 91, 93
Ghoshravan 12-13; inscription 12
Gobi desert 19
Gobhaṭa 95, 96
Gadhwal 75; inscription 80
gold coins 21, 58, 61-62, 64
Gollas, Hūṇa king 83
Gonda District 55
Gondophernes 22
Gopāla I 90
Gopatha Brāhmaṇa 29
gotra 90-91
Graeco-Roman art 24
Great Yue-chi 46, 48; clan 48
Greek 8-9, 11, 15-16, 29-23, 25-26, 47, 74, 152; alphabet 47; deity 25; Geographer 81; king 21, 53; language 23; legend 9; rule 21; scripts 23, 144
Guha 93
Guhila clan 54n, 70n, 81, 86-87, 92n, 97 and n, 98-99
Gujarat 55, 81, 84, 87
Gujarat-Maharashtra region 87
Gulka 61
Guntur District 57
Gupta dynasty 48-49, 63, 74, 83-84, 87-88, 89n, 90-93, 98; age 62n, 90; empire 48, 83, 90
Gupta-Valabhī era 98
Gurjara 84-86, 87n
Gurpiya month 13
Gurjara-Pratihāra dynasty 85
Gutschmid, Alfred von 48n
Haig, Wolseley 104
Haihaya clan 69, 70n, 71-74; king 69; princess 70n
Haklitre 14
Han dynasty 19-20, 43
Hangal Kadamba dynasty 80
Hankrail (Malda Dist.) 66
Haraha inscription 74n
Hari 93
Haridatta 93
Harihara 15
Harivaṁśa 34, 69
Harṣacarita 5, 85

Harṣavardhana 17, 98
Hariyādevī 86
Hasti-śāstra 30
Hazara District 27
Heliocles 21
Helios 11, 15
Hellenic 23
Hemacandra 86
Hephaistos 11, 15
Hepthalite 16
Herakles 15
Heraus (Miaus) 51 and n
Herat 46-48
Hermaios, Hermaius 9, 21, 53 and n
Hili-Balurghat region 80
Himagiri 83n
Himālaya 29, 75, 78, 80-81, 85; region 76, 84
Himalayan Ahicchatra 75
Himavat (Himālaya) mountain 80
Hīnayānist 26
Hindī 95
Hindu 10, 15, 18, 40n, 88n; population 40n
Hindukush 5, 26, 46, 48-49
hi-hou 20, 42-43
Hi-thun, Hi-tun 20, 42
Hiuen-tsang 6, 12, 18, 26-28, 42n, 44, 49-50, 58, 75, 81, 84
Hiu-mi 42
Hiung-nu 19-20
Hndstn (Hindustan) 47
Hoernle 60n
Homa-dhenu 72
Ho-mo 42
Honigmann 47n
Hool 86
Hoon 86
Hormazd II 47
Hoshiarpur -
Hou Han-shu 20, 41-43
Hryw (Herat) 47
Hūla 86-87
Hūṇa 16, 33, 48-49, 70, 83-86, 87 and n, 91; chief 16, 49, clan 86; country 86; king 49, 83, 86; kingdom 49; maṇḍala 85; race 85
Huṣka 13
Huṣkapura 13
Hu-tsao 42
Huviṣka 4-5, 13, 15-17, 22-23, 25, 45, 58n, 59n, 60n, 61n, 65
Ikhtiyār-uddīn Muḥammad bin Bakhtiyār Khaljī 43
Ikṣvāku family 73
Ili river 19
imitation copper coins 60-61
Imperial Gupta dynasty 73, 89
India 1-3, 5-6, 12, 18, 22-23, 28-29, 31-32, 34, 40, 43, 44 and n, 48, 50, 53, 55-56, 60, 62-65, 67, 69-76, 84, 87, 90-92, 104n
Indian 8, 15, 17, 21-24, 32, 52, 81, 90, 101; art 25; coins 47n, 50n, 57n, 62n, 64n; deity 25; languages 94; people 40n; sculpture 51n; society 85
Indo-Greek 24, 74
Indo-Scythian people 58n; country 63
Indo-Pakistan sub-continent 53
Indra 64n, 93
Indradeva 93
Indragupta 12
Indraprastha 40
Indus 8, 32, 35, 44n, 46-47, 57, 74, 76; valley 47, 57
Ionic pillar 24
Iran 1-2, 17, 21-22, 47, 56
Iranian 8, 12, 14, 16, 22-23, 92
Irāvatī 35
Īśānavarman 74n
Islām Shāh 101-03, 105-06
Jabalpur 69
Jagannātha-purī 82
Jahāngīr 102

Jain 18, 98
Jaipur 39, 78; Division 77; District 100, 106
Jajapella dynasty 7-9
Jajjapa 85
Jalālābād 12
Jālandhara 27
Jamadagni 62
Jammu 62n
Jārtika (Jāṭ) people 36
Jātaka 29
Jaugaḍa 61
Jaxartes 19
Jayāṇaka 70
Jayasvāmin 13
Jayasvāmipura 13
Jayasvāmi-virocana 13
Jayaswal, K. P. 59n
Jīvadharaṇa 95
Jīvaka 30
Jodhpur 78
Joṣī=Jyotiṣin 103
Jouveau-Dubreuil, G. 13
Junagadh 83, 85; inscription 83
Juṣka 13-14
Juṣkapura 13
Kabul 16, 20-21, 23, 32, 42-43, 48n, 52
Kachwara 104
Kadachi 99
Kadamba dynasty 74-75, 80, 90-91
Kadphises I 9-10, 17, 20-22, 42n, 43, 49, 51, 53 and n
Kadphises II 10-11, 17, 21, 43, 53, 59n
Kadphises, Kujula 43
Kadphises, Wema 43
Kafiristan 19, 21, 43, 50, 52
Kailvan inscription 56, 63, 66
Kaivarta community 64n
Kalacuri clan 69-70, 79, 86
Kalachuri-Haihaya 69
Kalatsuri 70
Kalhaṇa 13-14, 49n, 82n
Kali age 4, 71n
Kālidāsa 48, 83
Kaliṅga country 82; people 37, 71
Kaliṅganagara 82
Kalpadrukośa 82
Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā 56n
Kalyāṇa, Kalyāṇī 69
Kalyanpur stone inscription 99
Kāma country 80
Kāmān (near Bharatpur) 80
Kāmarūpa 91
Kamboja people 33 and n, 34, 73 and n
Kanara District 90
Kanaswa (Kotah Dist.) inscription 97
Kanauj 17, 85, 97-98
Kanaujiā 81
Kandahar in Afghanistan 33
Kane, P. V. 89n
Kāṅgḍā 75
Kānhaḍa 100
Kanhara 77
Kaṇiṣka 4-7, 12-13, 15, 17, 22-24, 44 and n, 45, 51-52, 53 and n, 58n, 60n, 61 and n; I 4-6, 8, 10-11, 13, 14-15, 17, 23-25, 43, 45, 55n, 64-65; his empire 55-56; era 4, 6, 12, 23, 44, 46, 56-57; II 5, 13, 17, 45
Kaṇiṣka-caitya 12
Kaṇiṣka-mahāvihāra 12
Kaṇiṣka-stūpa 13
Kannaḍa 75, 77
Kannara 77
Kan-suh 19
Kan-to-lo 6, 49
Kānyakubia 80, 97
Kao-fu 20, 42 and n, 43, 46, 51-52
Kapiśā 26, 44n, 50
Karashahr 45

Kargudari 80
Karimnagar 79
Karka Ḍiṇḍirāja 98
Karkoṭa-nāga 91
Karṇa 86
Karṇasīgha (Karṇasiṁha) 102
Karnal District 39
Karṇāṭa 76-77, 79-80
Karra Thana (Ranchi) 59
Kārtavīrya Arjuna 69
Kārttikeya 10, 66, 93
Kashgar 45, 47
Kashmir 13-15, 28, 30, 37, 49, 52n, 55, 73, 81-82, 84
Kāśī 31
Kāśīdāsa 101
Kāśī-Magadha 31
Kāśi people 37, 71
Kaṭaccuri 70
Kathiawar 83, 85, 87
Kauśāmbī 25-26, 57, 65, 90
Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa 29
Kāvyamīmāṁsā 39n
Kāyastha community 87-88, 91, 92n, 93
Kazakhstan 1-2
Keonjhar District 61
Keśavadāsa 102-03
Kesodāsa 103
Khairha plates 86
Khalatse (Ladakh) inscription 52n
Khaljī, Bakhtiyār 43, 54
Khaljī, Hussain Khān 104
Khān 49
Khān, Khawās 104-06
Khān, Shams 104
Kharoṣṭhī alphabet 10, 23, 26
Khasa people 36
'Kheechee' bard 86
Khiching (Mayurbhanj) 61
Khotan 4, 45 and n
Khurasan 47
Khusrū I Anoshirvan 49
Kidāra 48
Kien-chi 20, 52
Kien-she 20, 41-42, 52
Kieu-tsieu-k'io (Kusuluka= Kujula Kadphises) 20, 52
Ki-lien mountains 19
Kimudāsa 101
Ki-pin 19-20, 43, 49-52
Kirgizia 2
Kiṣkindhā 98
Kiṣkindhipura 99
Ki-to-lo (Kidāra) 48
Kiu-mi 20
Kiu-sha (Kuṣāṇa) 56n
K'iu-tsiu-k'io (Kadphises I) 43
Kolāñca (Kroḍāñca) 80
Komaro 15
Konow, Sten 41n, 42n, 43, 52n, 53n, 56n
Kosala 30; people 37
Kosalāḥ Kāśayo='ṅgāś=ca, etc. 38n
Kosam 53n, 55; inscription 53n
Kotah State 97
Kouei-Chouang 19-20
Kouseneon 47
Kozola-Kadaphes 9
Kroḍāñca 80
Kroṣṭu (Kroṣṭṛ) 70
Kṛṣṇa 16, 77, 100
Kṛṣṇarāja 97
Kṛtavīrya 69, 71
Kṣatriya 33, 37, 50, 64n, 71 and n, 72, 85, 88, 89 and n, 92, 95
K'sh (identified with Kashgarh) 47
Kucha 45
Kuei-shuang 19-20, 42-43, 51-52
Kujula 20; Kadphises 9, 51-52; Kara-Kadphises 54
Kujula Kasa 9
Kuknur 79
Kulapañjī 92n
Kulchur 70
Kumāra 15

Kumāracaritra 86
Kumāralāta 56n
Kumārpur 66
Kumāun 75, 80
Kumāun hill 105
Kumbhalgaḍh 103, 105
Kumbhalamera 101-02
Kumbhalamera-rājya 101
Kumbhalameru 105
Kumrahar 58n, 59
Kuṇḍa 91, 93
Kunduz river 11
Kuntala (Karṇāṭa) country 80
Kuravaḥ saha Pañcālāḥ, etc. 38n
Kuru 29, 31, 37, 71
Kuru-deśa 30
Kurukṣetra 38, 39, 71
Kuru-Pañcāla 29, 31, 37
Kuṣāṇa 3-5, 7-9, 13-17, 20-23, 25, 27, 31, 33, 41, 43, 45-47, 49, 51-64, 65 and n, 66-74; age 1, 3, 25, 74; art 23, 66, 67; chief 16, 53; clan 50, 52; coins 50, 57 and n, 59, 60n; culture 7; empire 1, 7-8, 19, 25, 41, 46, 48, 50, 52, 57n, 62, 67; gold coins 50, 58, 64; history 5-7, 11, 13, 15, 17, 21, 23, 25, 27, 31, 43, 45, 47, 49, 51, 53-55, 57, 59, 61, 63, 65, 67; inscription 26, 65; king 6-7, 14, 16-17, 25, 46-47, 54, 61, 63-65; kingdom 43, 51; monarch 25, 49; prince 9; rule 8; ruler 16, 53, 54; territory 47, 48
Kuṣān Malkā 47
Kuṣān Ṣāh 48n
Kuśasthala (Kānyakubja) 80
Kuśasthalī 80
Kushanou (Kuṣāṇa) 51
Kushanshahr 47
Kusuluka (Kujula Kadphises) 20, 52
Kuyula-kara-Kaphsa 54
Kwshnhstr (Kushanshahr) 47
Ladakh 52n
Laggo 12
Lahore Museum 9
Lake Issykkul 49
Lalitāditya 73
Lalla 76
Lamghan 28
Laṅkā 72
Lan-sheu 20
Lan-shi 20, 41, 42n, 43
Lāṭa 30
Law, B. C. 22; 81n
Leide 46n
Licchavi 30, 56-57; chief 30
Little Yue-chi 48
Lokamahādevī 70n
Lrooaspo 11, 15
Lüders 10, 15-16
Maasena 15
MacGovern 47n
Madhyadeśa 30
Madhyamā (Madhyamikā) 96
Madra, Madraka 36, 64n
Madhya Pradesh 57, 76, 96
Magadha 30-31, 49, 57, 63, 71, 84; people 37, 63n
Magha 95; dynasty 65-66
Mahābhārata 35, 39-40, 69, 72 and n
Mahāli 30
Mahantaka 99
Mahāpadma Nanda 71
Mahārāja, title of Bhetti, of Paḍḍa 98-99
Mahārājadhirāja title of Siṁharāja 99
Maharashtra 55, 69
Mahāsena 10, 15, 93
Mahasthan 58, 66
Mahattaka 100
Mahattama 100
Mahattara 100
Mahāvihāra 12
Mahāvṛṣa 30-31

Mahāyāna 11, 14, 24-26
Maheśa 100
Maheśvara 10-11, 18, 60, 69
Māhiṣmatī (Maheśvar or Māndhātā on the Narmadā) 69, 71
Maitraka dynasty 87-88, 91-92, 98
Maitreya 85n
Maithil Brāhmaṇ 81
Majjhimanikāya 33
Majumdar, N. G. 53n
Majumdar, R. C. 10n, 22n, 40n, 52n, 53n, 54n, 75n, 87
Majumdar-Sastri, 46n
Māladeva 104
Mālava clan 57
Malalasekera 30n
Malda (West Bengal) 58
Malhaṇa 76-77, 99
Malik Husām-uddīn Aghul Bak 54
Malla 30
Malwa 30, 49, 55, 69, 71n, 83-85, 96
Manaobago 11, 15
Mānavāyani clan 95
Mandasor 49 and n, 83, 96, 102; inscription 49n, 83-84, 97
Māndhātā 69
Mandsaur 96
Manikaratna (Puri Dist.) 60n, 61
Maṇiśaṅkar 88
Mañjughoṣa 93
mantra 30
Manu 34
Manusmṛti 29, 34, 39, 89
Mao 11, 15
Mārgabhūmisūtra 5
Mārgaśīrṣa 13, 100
Margiane (Merv) 46
Mariq 47n
Maroundai (Muruṇḍa) 63, 65
Marquart 42
Marshall, 55n
Marwar 79, 87-88, 104
maṭha 14
Mathana 77
Māṭhara-Kauṇḍinya-nyāya 36n
Mathurā 4, 6-7, 10, 13, 15-16, 25, 66-67, 97-98; artist 25; style 50n; region 39; inscription 4, 10, 13, 15-16, 98
Mātṛceṭa 3
Mātṛviṣṇu 84
Matsya 37, 38n
Maues 10, 21
Maukhari dynasty 57, 84
Maurya 22-23, 32-34, 97-98; dynasty 97-98; empire 34; king 97-98
Mayurbhanj 60; District 61
Mayūraśarman 90
Mayūravarman 75, 80
McCrindle 46n
Medapāṭa 86
Medes 32
Menander 24
Merv 46-47, 49
Meu-luen (Muruṇḍa) 63
Mevāḍ 79, 81, 86-87, 95-97, 99, 102-104, 105n, 106
Mewar 54n
Miaus 51n
Mihira 11, 16
Mihirakula 49, 83, 84 and n
Miiro 11, 15
Mioro 11, 15
Mirashi, V. V. 57n
Mishra, V. K. 58n, 59n
Mitra 57, 87-89, 91-93
Mitrasoma 95
Mithra 11
Miuro 11
Mkwrn (Makran) 47
Mogje 86
Monghyr 58
Monier-Williams 13
Mother-goddess 93, 95

Mozdooano 11
Mrgw (Merv) 47
Mughul 18, 62; emperor 18, 102-03, 105n
Muhammadan 101
Muiz-uddīn Muḥammad bin Sām 43, 54
Mūjavat 30-31
Mukherjee, B. N. 42n, 46n, 47n
Munich manuscript 35n
Muruṇḍa clan 63, 65 and n, 66
Muslim 17, 106; women 106
Muzaffarpur 59
Mysore 69, 74, 81, 90
Nāga 74, 76, 91
Nāgadatta 4, 87
Nāga-dhvaja (serpent-banner) 74
Nāga dynasty 70
Nagar (Nagarkot) 81, 87
Nagara (Kaliṅga-nagara) 82n
Nāgara (Nagara) Brāhmaṇa 72n, 81-83, 87-88, 92-93
Nagarahāra 12, 87
Nāgārjuna 5, 14
Nāgārjunikoṇḍa inscription 90
Nagarkot 81-82
Nāgarī 47, 81-82, 96-97, 100
Nagariā 81
Nāgasena 4
Naimiṣa 37
Na-kie (Nagara) 81
Na-kie-lo-ho (Nagarahāra) 81
Nana 11, 15, 17
Nanaia 11
Nanashao 11, 15
Nanda 87, 88 and n
Nanda dynasty 71
Nandangadh (Champaran Dist.) 59
Nandī 87, 88n
Nanjio 5
Naqsh-i-Rustam 47
Nārāyaṇa 100
Narendu (Varendra) 79
Narmadā 69, 72
Naugaon 61 and n
Nava-Nāga 4
Navasāhasāṅkacarita 85n
Nayagadh State 60
Neemuch 95
Nepal 56-57, 75, 81
Niamatpur (Rajshahi Dist.) 66
Nidhanpur plates 90
Nimar 69
Niyazī, 'Isa Khān 104
Nizamabad 79
Nizamat 78
Oado 11
Oakhsho 15
Oaninda, Oanindo 12, 15
Oesha 15, 17
Ojha, G. H. 4n, 95, 103n, 104
Ommo 15
Ooshna 15
Oraṁgajeba 102
Orissa 57-60, 62, 65-66, 82
'Oṛiya-Kuṣāṇa' 60
Orlagno 11
Oron 15
Oxford 18
Oxus 7-8, 19-20, 29, 41, 42 and n, 43-46, 48, 50, 52, 149
Pādonalakṣa 79
Pahlava 33, 73 and n
Pahlavī 47
Pāhuniyojana 80
Paikuli inscription 48n
Pakistan 1-2, 5, 21-22, 25, 36, 44, 46, 50, 53
Pāla dynasty 85, 90-91; army 85
Pali 31-32, 91, 94; literature 31
Pālita 91, 93
Pallava—dynasty 90-01; inscription 90
Pamir 42, 45
Pañcaka (Madraka or Mādraka or Yadu) 64n
Pañcāla people 29, 31, 37, 39, 71; country 80

Pañcanada 29, 34, 40
Pañcānāṁ Sindhu-ṣaṣṭhānāṁ, etc. 36n
Pan-chao 45
Panjshir river 20, 52; valley 42
Panjtar inscription 53-54
Pārada 73 and n
Paramamāheśvara 17
Paramāra king 85
Parasarāma 101
Paraśurāma 72, 101
Pargiter 4, 63n, 70n, 71n
Parinirvāṇa 14
Pāriyātra 97
Paropamisadae, Paropanisadai, same as the Kabul region 33, 46
Paropanisus 46
Parsee 18
Parthian 8, 22-23, 33, 57, 74
Paruck 47n, 48n, 49
Parwan 20, 42
Pāśupata 26
Pātāla (nether world) 74
Pāṭaliputra 55, 63, 98
Pāṭaliputra-nagara 81
Patna 13, 55, 58n, 59 and n; city 58n; District 3, 66
Patañjali 34
Patiala 40; District 39-40
Pātisāha 101, 103
Pathan 105n
Pattana 82n
Pehoa (Karnal Dist.) 39
Periplus of the Erythraean Sea 64
Persia 47n
Persian 11, 15, 32, 105
Peshawar 6, 12-14, 24, 30, 44, 47-48, 54; casket inscription 53n
Pharro 11, 15
Pillibhit District (U.P.) 76-77
Pitāmaha 37
Po-lu-sha (Peshawar) 48
Po-mao 42
Pondicherry 3
Poona 22
Po-ta (near Kabul) 52
Po-t'iao 5
Prabhākaravardhana 85
Prabhāvatībāī 102
Pradyota 71 and n
Prāg-Hūṇaka 45n
Prajāpati 36
Prājjunaka 35
Prakrit 10, 23, 94
Prāṇaka 35n
Prārjuna 35n
praśasti 95-96
Prasenajit 30
Prasthala 36
Pratihāra dynasty 85
Pratirathās=tu Vāhīkāḥ, etc. 38n
Premakuṇḍa 93
Pṛthūdaka (Pehoa, Karnal Dist.) 39
Pṛthvīrāja 101
Pṛthvīrājarāso 86
Pṛthvīrājavijaya 70
P'rtn (in Baluchistan) 47
Pshkbwr 47
Ptolemy 46 and n, 63, 65, 81
Pulastya 72
Pulikāla 74
Pulinda 64n
Pu-lu-sha-pu-lo 7
Punch 27
Puṇḍarīkākṣa 99
Puṅgala 79
Puṇika 71, 71n
Punjab 32, 43, 44n, 52-53, 65, 84-85, 157; Museum 9
Puṇya-śālā 16
Puṇyasoma 95
Purāṇa 4, 29, 34, 63 and n, 71 and n, 73, 94
Purasāhaṇaka 79
Purī 60-61, 82; District 60-61

'Purī-Kuṣāṇa' 60
Pūrṇatalla 78
Puruṣamedha 31
Puruṣapura (Peshawar) 6-7, 12, 44, 53
Purushāvar 12
Puruṣottama-purī (Jagannātha-purī) 82
Puruṣottamasiṁha 80
Pushkar-Ajmer region 99-100
Puṣkalāvatī 32
Puṣkara 99-100
Pu-ta (near Kabul) 43
Qushani 46
Qanungo 104
Raghuvaṁśa 48, 83
Raghunathgarh 78
Rakha hill (Singhbhum Dist.) 62
Rājā Bisālkāgaḍh 59n
Rājapura, same as Rajauri (Kashmir) 38
Rajasthan 44, 55, 57, 65, 69 and n, 78 and n, 81, 84, 86n 95-96, 98, 100, 102, 104
Rājasthānī language 100
Rājasthānīya 96
Rājataraṅgiṇī 5, 13-15, 30, 49n, 55, 73, 74n, 82n, 84
Rājyavardhana 85, 95
Rajauri (Kashmir) 28, 38
Rājpūt clans 74, 86-87
Rājaputra 95
Rajputana 103n
Rajshahi District 66.
Rākṣasa king 72
Rāma 93
Rāmacandra 101-02, 106
Rāmadāsa 103
Rāmamitra 93
Rāmāyaṇa 32, 71-72
Ramnagar (Bareily Dist) 75, 81
Rāmpura 102
Rampura State 102
Rāṇā 104, 106 and n
Ṛanchi 58, 59
Rannā (Rājñī) 99
Rannāditya (Sūrya) 99
Rapson 47n, 55n
Rāṣṭra 95
Rāṣṭrakūṭa 77
Rāṣṭravardhana 75
Ratanpur 69
Rāṭhod Jāgīrdār (Keśavadāsa) 102
Rāvaṇa 72
Ravisoma 93
Rawalpindi 29-30
Ray, H. C. 49n, 78n, 79n, 86n
Raychaudhuri, H. C. 3, 5, 20, 52n, 56n, 63
Revā 72n
Rhys Davids 29
Rom 15
Raman 23, 53, 61
Roy, N. B. 106n
Rudra 93
Rudradāsa 93
Rudradāman I 4-5
Rupiya, silver coin 62
Sachau 12
Ṣaḍarhadvana 14
Śagara 73
Sahasrabāhu 69
Sahasrāda 70
Sahasrajit 70
Sahasrārjuna 69
Sahni, Daya Ram 100
Ṣaiśunāga dynasty 71
Ṣaiva 10, 17, 26, 83
Ṣaivism 40n
Ṣaka 5-6, 10, 14, 21, 23, 33-34, 40, 51, 55, 65, 71, 73 and n, 100, 102, 147; era 6, 56; king 10, 48n; land 19; satrap 5, 55, 57, 66; settlement 21
Ṣaka-Kuṣāṇa 4
Ṣākala (Sialkot) 5, 84
Ṣākambhara (Ṣākambharī) 78-79
Ṣākambharā 77
Ṣākambharī (goddess) 78

Ṣākambharī (Sapādalakṣa) 78-79
Sakastān 21, 47
Sāketa 55
śākhā 91
Sakrai 78
Ṣākyasiṁha 14
Salema Sāha 102
Salene 11
Salīm Shāh 102
Sālva clan 37
Sambhal 106
Sambhar 100; lake 78
Saṁgrāmadeva 101
Sammatīya School 26
Samudragupta 4
Sanchi 13, 55 and n
Sanchi inscription 13, 55n
Sāṅgā 102
Saṅgharakṣa 5
Saṅgrāmasiṁha 101
Saṅgrāmasiṁha II 103
Ṣaṅkarādevī 77
Ṣaṅkarapattana 82n
Sanskrit 13, 77, 94-95, 100
Sapādalakṣa 75, 78-79
Sapādalakṣīya 79
Sapharakasena 103
Sarapho 15
Sarasvatī, river 9
Saraswati, S. K. 25, 51n, 67n
Ṣarmā (Ṣarman) 87, 89n, 92.
Ṣarman 87, 89
śarman (family name) 88, 92
Sarnath (Varanasi Dist.) 55
Sarva 10
Sarvajñaśānti 12
Sarwani, Abbas 104; Ahmed 104
Ṣāryāta 71
Sassanian 17, 47-48; coins 47n;
  dynasty 17; king 47-49
Sastri 56n
Ṣatadru 27, 35
Ṣatapatha Brāhmaṇa 27
Ṣātavāhana 5
Satlaj 47
Sauḍa (Gauḍa) 30
Ṣaunaka 29
Sauvīra people 36
Savālakh range 75, 79
Sayambhara (Ṣākambhara) 79
Schoff 64n
Scythian 21-23, 33, 57, 63
Scytho-Kuṣāṇa 64
Scytho-Parthian 74; era 56
Seistan 21, 47
Sekhawati region 78
Seleucid empire 21
Seleucus 32
Semitic 47n
Sena 92-93
Sera Sāhī Sūra 101
Ṣeṣa-nāga 91
Set-Mahet 55
Sewell 76n
Shāhī 48n
Shaoreoro, Shāhrewar 15
Shāpūr I 47
Sher Shāh 101, 103-04 and n,
  105n, 106n
Shi-ki 19, 41
Sh'sh'st'n (Tashkent) 47
Shuang-mi 20, 42
Si 45
Sialkot 5-6, 27; District 6
Siddhapura 82
Sijistan 21
silver coins 51 and n
Siṁhapura 27
Sind 43, 55
Sinda clan 69, 74-77
Sindh 32
Sindhu 32, 52, 74-76, 97
Sindhu people 36
Sindhurāja 85
Sindoo (Sindhu) 74
Singbhum 62
Singh, Udai (Udaya) 104

Sircar, D. C. 3, 29, 50n, 54n, 57n, 70n, 71n, 73, 74n, 76n, 77n, 80n, 81n, 83, 85n, 87, 89n, 91n, 92n, 93, 96n, 97,
Sirhind 47
Sisupalgadh (Puri Dist.), 60
Sitabhinji (Keonjhar Dist.) 60-61
Sitamau 102
Śiva 10-11, 15-18, 84
Śivadatta 90
Siwalik (Savālakh) range 74-75, 79, 81
Sīyaka II 85
Si-yu-ki 6.
Skanda 10, 15
Skandagupta 48, 83
Skanda Purāṇa 72n
Skando 15
Skstn (Sakastān) 47
Smith, V. A. 10-12, 24, 45n, 48n, 49n, 84n
Smṛti 22
Sogdiana, Sogdiane 19, 21, 46-47
Soked (Sāketa) 55
Soma 91, 93
Song-yun 48
Soter Megas 53
South Bihar 30
Soviet Republics 3
Śramaṇa 34
Śrāvasti 80
Śrautasūtra 30
Śrīmāla-Brāhmaṇa 88
Śrīnagara (Śrīnagarī) 81-82.
Śrīpura 82n
Śrīvatsa-gotra 78
Sse-ki 19
Ssuma-ch'ien 19
Stein 13-14, 45n, 49n, 82n
Sten Konow 5, 20
stūpa 12-13
Śūdra 33, 37, 39 and n, 89 and n, 92
Suivihar inscription 55
Sultanganj (Bhagalpur Dist.) 58
Śuṅga dynasty 90
Suṇika 71n
Sūr dynasty 101, 103-105, 106 and n
Sūrasena clan 71
Sūrasenaka 39
Surāṣṭra 48n, 83; people 38
Surkh Kotal 11, 14, 23, 44, 55
Sūrya 99; images 66
Sūryasena 101
Sūryaseni 101
Śuṣkaletra 14
Svaiḍāyana Śaunaka 29
svayaṁvara 86
Swgd (Sogdiana) 47
Swat 27, 32
Sykes 47n
Tagdumbash Pamir 45
Ta-hia 19-20, 41-42, 44, 46, 51-52
Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa 31
Tajikistan 1-3
Ṭakka 27
Takkola 63
Taklamakan 19
Takṣaśilā 8, 27, 29-32
Tālajaṅgha 71, 73
ṭaṁ (*ṭaṅka*) 103
Tamil Nadu 80
T'ang-shu 42
ṭaṅka 62n, 103
Tārīkh-i-Shershāhī 104
Tarim basin 45
Tashkent 47
Tashkurghan Pass 45
Taxila 24; inscription 54
Ta Yue-chi 43, 51
Thakur, U. 84n, 87n
Thaneswar 85
Thomas 5, 85n
Thomas, F. W. 3, 5n, 22n. 85n,
Tien-chan mountain 19
Tien-chou 43, 46, 51-52
T'eu-kia-li 63

Tocharian language 16
Tod, J. 69n, 86, 104
Toda-Raising 100-03, 106 and n; inscription 102-03, 106
Tokhāra 26
Tonk 100; District 81
Toramāṇa 49, 83-84
Tou-mi 20
Trailokyamahādevī 70
Trans-Oxus region 21, 44-46
Trātā (Trātṛ) 87
Trātaka (Trātṛka) 88
Trātṛ 87, 89
Trātṛka 88
Tripathi, R. S. 98n
Tripurī 69
Ts'ien Han-shu 19
Tsung-ling (Pamir) 6-7, 42, 44-45
Tsunn-hoang 19
Tu-ho-lo (Tukhāra) 42
Tukhāra 42
Tu-mi 42n
Tuṇḍikera 71
Tung T'ien-chu 56n
Tun-huang 19
Turfan 49
Turk 33, 49, 54
Turkish 43, 66, 70
Turkmenistan 1-2
Turuṣka 13, 14, 73 and n
Twarn 47
Udaipur State 97, 104
Udayapura 102, 103 and n, 104, 106
Udaiyasiṁghadeva 101
Udayasiṁha 101-03, 105 and n, 106
Uddālaka 29
Udīcya 29-32, 39; Brāhmaṇa 31 ; *veśa* 66
Ujjain 3
Ujjayinī 10
Umā 15
Una (near Junagadh) 85
UNESCO 1-3
Uniyara 81
Utarā (Darbhanga District) 59
Uttarāpatha 29, 31-34, 85
Uttar Pradesh 43, 53-55, 57, 65, 75-76, 80, 97
USSR 1-2, 7, 50
Uzbekistan 1-3
Vado 11
Vāhīka 36
Vaidya, C. V. 87n
Vairavarman 76
Vaiśālī Museum 59n
Vaiṣṇava 14
Vaiṣṇavism 40n
Vaiśya 33, 37, 89 and n, 90, 92
Vaivasvata Manu 70
Vājasaneyi Saṁhitā 31
Vajraghoṣa 93
Vajrāsana 58n
Vākpati II Muñja 85
Valā 87
Valabhī 87, 92, 98; kings 88, 92
Vaṁkṣu (Oxus) 48, 83
Vanavīra 103
Vapyaṭa 90
Vārāṇasī 25-27, 30 ; District 55
Varendra 79, 91n
Vārhanīpati 100
Varmā (Varman) 87-88, 89n, 92
Varman (Varmā) 87-90, 92
Varṇa 89, 91, 93
Vasāti people 35
Vaskuṣāṇa 55n
Vasu 93
Vāsudeva 4-5, 16-17, 45-46, 58n, 59n, 61, 63, 65; Kṛṣna 16
Vāsudeva I 5, 8, 49
Vāsiṣka 5, 13-14, 45, 55 and n
Vasiṣṭha 73
Vāta 11
Vatsa-gotra 18, 77
Vāyu Purāṇa 34n
Veda 30, 37
Veṅgī 70

Vernāg 14
vihāra 12-16
Vijayakīrti 4
Vajheṣka 13
Vikramāditya 3, 57, 71n
Vikramāditya II 70n
Vikrama-saṁvat (era) 57, 95, 98-100, 102-03
Vima-Kadphises 51-52, 54
Vinaśana-tīrtha 39
Vinayāditya 70n
Vināyakaguha 93
Vindhya 97
Vipāśā 35
Vipra 89n
Vīradeva 12
Viratgadh (Mayurbhanj) 60-61
Virocana 13
Viśākhamitra 63, 66
Viṣṇu 13, 15-16, 64n, 66-67, 77-78, 99; image 66-67
Viṣṇuvardhana 70n
Viśvakarman 15
Viśvasphāci 63
Viśvasphāṇi 63 64n
Viśvasphāṭi 63
Viśvasphāṭika 63
Viśvasphīti 63
Viśvasphūrji 63
Viśvasphūrti 63
Viṣyaphīni 63
Vitastā 14, 36
Vitastātra 14
Vītihotra 71n
Vithvutur 14
Vṛddhanagara 82
Vṛṣṇi 40
Vyāghra-lāñchana (tiger-crest) 74
Vima Kadphises 10, 59n
Wakhan 20, 42, 52
Wang 20
Wardak (Afghanistan) 13, 45
Wardha District 57
Watters, 5-6, 12, 18, 26, 38n, 44n, 49n, 84n
Wei (Oxus) 41
Wei dynasty 48
Wei-lio 46-47, 51
Wema Kadphises 43
West Bengal 58, 60, 66
West Malwa 83
West Pakistan 5, 21-22, 25, 29-30, 33, 44, 46
Western Turks 49
Whitehead 9, 15, 17, 23, 51n
Winternitz, M. 3, 72n
Wu-hu (Oxus) 42
Wu-sun 19
Yab--gou 20
Yādava 70
Yadu clan 64n, 70
Yajña-Ṣātakarṇi 5
Yarkand 45
Yaśaḥkarṇa 86
Yaśodatta 30
Yaśodharman Viṣṇuvardhana 49, 83-84, 96-98
Yaśogupta 95
Yaśovarmapura-vihāra 13
Yaudheya clan 65
Yavana 33-34, 73n, 74
Yavana-Kamboja 34n
Yellow river 44n
Yen-kao-chen (Kadphises II) 43, 52
Yeotmal District 57
Yuan Chwang (Hiuen-tsang) 5, 12, 84n
Yue-chi 19-21, 41-43, 45-46, 48, 50n, 51-52, 56
Yugala (Puṅgala) 79

Addenda et Corrigenda

Page 7, line 1.—*Read*—Pu-lu-sha-pu-lo
„ 15, line 18.—*Read*—Komaro (Skanda-Kumāra)
„ „ foot-note 21.—*Add*—As regards the names Ardokhso, Oakhsho and Araiksho, attention may be drawn to the Bag-Ard or Ard-Vakhsh mentioned in a Manichean text from Chinese Turkestan. Cf. *Artibus Asiae,* Vol. XXXI, 1969, p. 197 and note 15.
„ 17, line 9.—*Read*—Ṣiva
„ „ line 32.—Read—*Paramamāheśvara*
„ 20, line 7.—*Read*—Afghanistan
„ 21, line 28.—*Add note*—Sten Konow read the name of *Maharaya* Aya (Azes) and the date 'year 80' in a Shahdaur (Hazara District) inscription in Kharoṣṭhī (*Ep. Ind.,* Vol. XIX, p. 200). The epigraph may suggest that Azes I was ruling, in 23 A.D., over the Hazara region. The date of another Shahdaur inscription (*ibid.,* p. 199), 'year 60', when a local chief named Namijada was ruling, is styled *Ṣaka-sabatśara* (Ṣaka year) and would correspond to 3 A.D.
„ 23, line 5.—*Read*—Ṣaka
„ „ line 12.—*Read*—influence
„ 27, line 13.—*Read*—Bolor
„ „ foot-note 20.—*Read*—Vol. I, p. 199
„ 28, line 24.—*Read*—Takṣaśilā
„ 30, line 26.—*Read*—Peshawar
„ „ foot-note 6, line 4.—*Read*—Lāṭa and Ṣauḍa
„ 42, line 3.—*Read*—marketing
„ „ foot-note 4.—*Add*—According to the *Shi-ki,* "In the west, they (the Yue-chi) defeated the Ta-hia and made them subject to themselves. Thereafter they lived to the north of the Oxus river and established their headquarters there" (Konow, *op. cit.,* p. liii). According to the *Tsien Han-shu,* the five principalities of Ta-hia, each under a *hi-hou,* "all depended on the Ta-Yue-chi" (*ibid.,* p. lvi). The *T'ang-shu* mentions a locality called Kuei-shuang-ni-kia in K'ang, midway between Samarkand and Bokhara (*loc. cit.*). The Kuei-shuang principality in Bactria may have been founded by the Yue-chi group hailing from that locality.

Page 51, line 8.—*Read*—chieftain
,, ,, foot-note 35, line 1. —Read—*Soviet Union*
,, 55, line 13.—*Read*—Śaka
,, 59, line 6.—*Read*—Utarā, *for*—Vatara
,, ,, foot-note 35, line 1.—Read—*ASI, AR*
,, 60, foot-note 41, line 5.—Read—*History of Orissa*
,, 78, foot-note 32, line 5.—Read—*nṛpāṇām*
,, 79, line 13.—*Read*—Karṇāṭa
,, 81, line 24.—*Read*—Ptolemy
,, 82, line 2.—*Read*—or Siddhapura
,, 83, top.—*Read*—II, *for*—IV
,, 87, line 11.—*Read*—Bhavnagar
,, 91, line 5.—Omit—*soma*
,, 93, line 29.—*Read*—Gaṇeśa
,, 100, line 2.—*Read*—Pushkar-Ajmer
,, 104, line 6.—*Read*—Wolseley
,, 105, foot-note 23.—*Add*—There are many other cases of fictitious achievements described in penegyrics. Thus the theme of the '*Alīnāma* is the description of the imaginary defeat of the Mughul army at the hands of 'Alī 'Adil Shāh II. See *S. K. Bhuyan Com. Vol.*, p. 146.

State Museum Library Lucknow

23. *Indian Epigraphy*, Delhi, 1965.—"It is a magnificent work for which the author deserves the congratulations of all students of Indology."—R. C. Majumdar in *Journ. Ind. Hist.*, Trivandrum.

24. *The Guhilas of Kiṣkindhā*, Calcutta, 1965.—"......a book which no one concerned with Rajput history can afford to overlook, which few concerned with Indian dynastic history would want to overlook, and from which many could profit."—Thomas R. Trautmann in *BSOAS*, London.

25. *Indian Epigraphical Glossary*, Delhi, 1966.—"......a contribution of the utmost importance... will continue to be an indispensable work of reference for many years to come."—S. K. Chatterjee in *Journ. Or. Inst.*, Baroda.

26. *Cosmography and Geography in Early Indian Literature*, Calcutta, 1967.—"... the reader will find in this book a painstaking collection of valuable data from all possible sources..."—R. C. Majumdar, Calcutta.

27. *Studies in the Society and Administration of Ancient and Medieval India*, Vol. I—*Society*, Calcutta, 1967.—"... it is unlikely that any single scholar will be able to follow Professor Sircar into everyone of the fascinating corners of Indian life that he explores......There is something of value here for any one interested in Indian society."—W. D. O'Flaherty in *BSOAS*, London.

28. *Studies in Indian Coins*, Delhi, 1968.—"......Professor Sircar's wide knowledge of Indian history, literature, epigraphy and metrology...... demonstration of the fact that outstanding Indian historical minds are now engaged in significant scholarship in Indian monetary history".—C. E. Weber in *The Num ismatist*.

29. *Ancient Malwa and the Vikramāditya Tradition*, Delhi, 1969.—"Prof. Sircar......formulates certain definitive conclusions which, for the ability shown in dealing with confused masses of legends and traditions and conflicting testimony of diverse sorts, bear the unmistakable stamp of an illuminating and convincing exposition."

30. *Landlordism and Tenancy in Ancient and Medieval India as revealed by Epigraphical Records*, Lucknow University, 1969.—"Dipping deep into the well of his knowledge, Prof. Sircar has brought to our notice...the rights, privileges and advantages permissible to the donees from the state, the king or the grantee,...the burden of taxes and allied obligations on the tenantry."—K. K. Dikshit, Lucknow.